CHILD STUDY

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL of PARENT EDUCATION

SPRING, 1943

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial	66
Women in the War: What Price to the Family?	67
The Roots of War in Human Nature: Aggression and Hate in Childhood and Family Life	72
Our Children: The War and the Peace	78
Parents' Questions and Discussion	80
Suggestions for Study	81
Book Reviews	82
Children's Books	84
Radio Programs for Children	86
Parent Education in the Child Care Program	87
News and Notes	93
In the Magazines	94

THIRTY CENTS A COPY VOL. XX, NO. 3 ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

EDITORIAL BOARD
PAULINE RUSH FADIMAN
Editor
SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG
ANNA W. M. WOLF
JOSETTE FRANK

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES
ZILPHA CARRUTHERS FRANKLIN
HELEN G. STERNAU

CHARLOTTE WILLIAMS
Advertising Manager

CHILD STUDY reentered as second class matter December 6, 1939, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1943, by Child Study Association of America, Inc. Published by the Child Study Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y. Quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer issues; published in November, February, April and June. Thirty cents a copy, one dollar a year. Add twenty-five cents for all foreign subscriptions.

HEADLINES

This issue of CHILD STUDY contains a résumé of the proceedings of the Annual Institute of the Child Study Association, held on March 1, 1943.

★

The speakers at the first session, *Women in the War: What Price to the Family?* were: Lyman Bryson, Director of Education, CBS; Sara F. Southall, Consultant, War Manpower Commission; Lawrence K. Frank; Lisa Sergio, radio commentator, WQXR; and Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Director of the Child Study Association of America.

On *The Roots of War in Human Nature:* Austin H. MacCormick, Executive Director, Osborne Association; Mary Shattuck Fisher, Professor of Child Study, Vassar College; Karl Menninger, M.D., Director of the Menninger Clinic; and Margaret Mead, Assistant Curator of Ethnology, American Museum of Natural History.

On *Our Children: The War and the Peace:* Anna Arnold Hedgman, Regional Racial Relations Adviser for Civilian War Services of the Office of Civilian Defense; Eduard C. Lindeman, New York School of Social Work; Alice V. Keliher, Director, Child and Youth Services, C.D.V.O.; Tracy Strong, Secretary, World's Committee of the Y.M.C.A.; Ruth Taylor, Commissioner of Public Welfare of Westchester County, and Anna W. M. Wolf, of the Child Study Association.

★

The Summer issue of CHILD STUDY will discuss "Habit Training—Does It Build Character?"

EDITORIAL

BECAUSE of the wartime travel restrictions, this year's Annual Institute of the Child Study Association had been planned on a smaller scale, without the usual nation-wide representation. Yet so great was the public interest in the subject, "The American Family, 1943—Facing the Second Year of War," that attendance was much larger than had been anticipated—more than a thousand people packed the conference room at the Hotel Roosevelt.

THE FAMILY seems to be back in fashion again. For a long time we have been hearing about the disintegration of the family—how shaky it was getting, how it was losing its influence over children. But now that we are at war its prestige has suddenly been restored. Everywhere it is being hailed as the most important force on the home front, and children's morale, we are told, is entirely dependent on their parents' morale. In trying to crush the family, the dictators have given us proof that for all its faults, its lack of training, its inefficiency, the family still possesses the fundamental power to mould children that no other institution or organization can duplicate.

IT IS encouraging also to note that the speakers who took part in the Institute did not limit their discussions to the special problems confronting the family only in wartime. There was throughout the endeavor to discover which among the various emergency measures and services we are now setting up may turn out to be of permanent value for children and families after the war.

THE EDITORS

Women in the War: What Price to the Family?

Chairman: Lyman Bryson
Speakers: Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg, Sara E. Southall, Lisa Sergio, Lawrence K. Frank

Total war inevitably makes new demands on women and the home. Is it wise national policy for mothers of families to engage in large-scale war work? How can we safeguard the family while meeting the nation's war needs? What can we learn from Europe? The rôle of women in the post-war society.

LYMAN BRYSON

A GREAT many of the women that I see now seem to be having a terrifically good time out of the war, and I am not sure that women are any different from men in the cycle of emotions that they go through when war breaks up the normal course of the life of a nation. I am enough of a pacifist to think that peace is normal and war is not. It seems to me that in the beginning phases of war there is a tremendous amount of just sheer enjoyment in pushing aside every serious problem which has been disturbing you for a long time, thinking that you can't possibly answer those problems now and leaping into things which look interesting and amusing and exciting. That is the first phase of it. I don't see any difference between men and women in this reaction. It seems to me we all respond to the glamorous changes which war brings into life and we all regret it in the same way when the real pull comes and we find out what war really is.

One of the things which has bothered me about the approach to this problem is that I don't see much being done to prevent people from taking the war as a kind of escape. We are told that the war is a total war, and we generally misinterpret the significance of that term to mean that everybody should get into something which could specifically be called war work.

I suspect that that is not what it means at all, that what total war really means is that whatever you do will have some effect upon the success or failure of the war effort. If people took the second interpretation rather than the first, there would not be so many people rushing to do, in a second rate and amateurish way, things they think have to do with the war, instead of staying on the job and doing in a reasonably first-class way the things that are their own peculiar contribution to the civilization in which they live. The evil in war is not only that it disrupts so many lives, but that too many people seek disruption instead of resisting it.

Another question I would like to raise is, what is being done for those who live by very much coarser and rougher patterns of ideals in life than we are likely to be discussing here? I am thinking of the kind of people who are the listeners to the daytime serials on the radio, people who write great packets of letters saying, "I guide my life by what goes on in this particular serial."

We have perhaps twenty million mothers in this country whose patterns of behavior come from the cheaper magazines, the movies and from the radio serials. Those mothers are going to lose sons in as real a fashion, and the loss of those sons is going to come home to them quite as deeply as if they had more intellectualized patterns of behavior to guide them.

What is being done to strengthen the fortitude of the vast number of people in this country who are completely out of touch with the kind of thinking which goes on in a conference such as this? What are we going to do for *hoi polloi* who suffer quite as much as anybody else? What kind of contact—even though it must be an indirect and more diffused contact—can we give them with these ideas?

Because if these ideas that we talk about—these ideas about the impact of the war upon the family, upon the lives of women—are not good for the women who take their guidance out of what to you seem quite ridiculous sources, if the ideas we have are not any good for these women, then they probably are not any good at all.

I would like the experts to tell us first how we can keep people from seeking disruption, and second, how we can make the wisdom that we know exists in some measure available to everybody; because, after all, the deaths and the casualty lists come home to everybody. Perhaps during wartime, when the spotlight is focussed on family dislocations, we can begin to rebuild the family by attacking some of the peacetime problems that women are running away from at this time.

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

WOMEN today have a rather uncertain place in our society, and it seems absurd that in all the plans for education and plans for various services which we make in war or peace that some elemental, simple facts are not kept in mind. I am thinking about such facts, for instance, as that a woman has a dual rôle, that she is different from man and that for a large number of adult years she has the responsibility of child bearing and child rearing, in addition to any other activities that she may want to undertake. It seems trite to say this, but even colleges and other educational organizations do not take this practically into consideration.

The confusion about woman's dual rôle came out very concretely some years ago in a magazine contest held to find out what high school boys and girls thought about marriage and family life. There were thousands of answers and they were very revealing and educative. Ninety-nine per cent of the girls in the upper grades of high schools all through the country answered that they hoped to get married and have children. When asked whether they thought they were going to prepare for some work after graduation ninety-five per cent of them said, "Yes," and mentioned nursing, teaching, social work, acting, and many other things. Always there was some vision of their participation in the world's work. But when one of the questions further down on the list asked, "Do you believe that a woman who is married and has children can do any outside work?" ninety-seven per cent of the same girls said "No."

Now, here is woman in conflict, and the ones who do try to make some kind of combination out of home and work, especially if there isn't a real economic necessity to do so, always have a guilty feeling about their absence from home. There never is a time when a woman really feels she is free to fulfill this dual rôle.

Society has not helped to set standards to guide her conduct. Each woman becomes an individual pioneer to work out a pattern which seems socially acceptable. Of course a problem with which we have not come to terms during peacetime will hardly be settled in wartime. But the hope is that the war and all the extreme needs which it brings forth will, by focussing our attention on these problems in an exaggerated form, perhaps shed new light on what is desirable and possible in peacetime.

The other factor that does not seem to be kept in mind is that a woman's life comes in phases. If she is a mother, a large period of her adult years is taken up by this time-consuming and emotion-consuming occupation. But with fewer children and the lengthening of human life beyond sixty and seventy, there are a great many adult years when women are not primarily concerned with this dual function. So that if they make a business out of motherhood alone and use all their executive ability in that direction, the families actually suffer from too much minute attention to detail and not enough freedom to develop.

Part-time occupations seem to many of us a solution, or at least a partial solution. If women who have children could work certain days of the week or certain hours of the day, it would remove that feeling of isolation that working alone at home brings and that makes them seek outside activities. The day after Pearl Harbor, every social agency in this city was swamped by women who gladly volunteered, without any pay at all, three or four afternoons a week. Patriotism was a strong motive, of course, but also the fact that here was a chance to get out of the home—and with social approval. Many of them were highly trained women who had been in hiding, who had not been contributing their training and their skill to their community life.

The services that are now being organized ought to keep in mind that family life should not be disrupted any more than is absolutely necessary. We seldom really think in terms of the family. For example, even in organizing schools for children the family had never been considered. The hours the children are kept in school or the hours that the children are expected to arrive at school have no relationship to the family pattern. We now consider school lunches for children on the basis of nutrition. But it has long been apparent that having children rush into the house to snatch a hasty meal was a disrupting factor for the woman of the household and for the children themselves. This was never considered an important enough matter for the schools to bear in mind in setting up their schedules.

Now that we are organizing services for the after-school care of little children, let us do it in a spirit to strengthen family ties and not just merely as a stop-gap service which will enable women to perform some outside function. Perhaps we can learn something out of this experience that will stand us in good stead after the war. We know that a lot of informal services are needed for the family in order to allow women to take their place as real adult members of the community, that children suffer when they have mothers who always stay behind in the literal sense

of the word when they go forth to school and into the community.

Total war involves the total family. But even in this emergency we ought to be ingenious and forward looking enough to see that anything that hurts family life and that disrupts it is not going to be good for production; it is not going to be good for the war effort, or for the peace to come.

SARA E. SOUTHALL

THE problem of women in industry has been aptly described by Dr. Max Lerner in this statement: "When the classic work on the history of women comes to be written, the biggest force for change in their lives will turn out to have been war."

One of the first things to understand about the labor supply picture over the country today is that it is not entirely the reverse of the depression years. During the early days of the depression every part of the American economy was hit, and the resulting unemployment was nation-wide. However, in the high industrial activity due to the war, the situation now is utterly different, what is commonly described as "spotty." Naturally, when the country had to gear itself as fast as possible to war production, contracts were given where equipment and factories already existed or could be most readily converted. As the difficulties in this policy began to crop up, the policy was changed, and contracts are not given out today in communities where the manpower problem is critical.

Some months ago, perhaps later than it should have been done, the Manpower Commission issued a policy statement urging that where it is necessary to train and employ large numbers of women, the following order of procedure in recruiting be followed. First, that all single women in the community be intensively recruited; second, married women with no children; third, married women with children over fourteen years of age; and last, married women with school age and under school age children. They also urged that no barriers of race, age or creed be set up to limit this labor supply, and that we make good the long-quoted slogan, "Equal pay for equal work."

Frankly, we do not yet know the techniques of making a woman who is of the so-called "leisure class" in a community feel that she cannot live with her conscience at night unless she gives up this leisure and takes a job either in essential industry or even in less essential employment, so as to release a person who might have greater skills for war industry. Had we been able to reach this type of woman we would not have so many school and nursery problems.

We have, as yet, done far too little in the development of part-time employment for women. If this had developed consistently along with a well-planned community program in each critical area, we could probably be able to release many full-time workers from less essential industry who are prepared to work full time, and use women who have children in part-time employment. Under such circumstances women could work about four hours a day without disrupting their home life and the supervision of their own children.

The year 1942 did not really develop manpower shortages that interfered with the war effort, but the forecast for 1943 is a very different picture. The call of the armed forces will be greater, and the peak of war production has not been reached. If we do not, as individuals in our own communities, put our shoulders to the wheel to be sure that broad community services are developed, we will have a train of social problems developing which will last not only through this generation, but at least a generation or two afterward.

I do not in any way mean to say that there aren't individual group activities going on over the country that are extremely intelligent and helpful. One case came to my attention recently involving a group of wives of college professors in one of the West coast cities. Most of these women had been teachers previously. Suddenly there was such a terrific shortage of teachers that the closing down of some schools was threatened. These faculty wives got together and went back into teaching, leaving one of their group to do the marketing and take care of the other's children. Though there are many examples of this sort of cooperation, we must be conscious, on the other hand, that there are trailer camp communities with little or no adequate health and recreation facilities appearing spottily all over the country.

I don't personally worry too much about the few reports that one gets of a rather rough type of girl, who perhaps out-swaggers, out-swears, and out-drinks the male. We have always had a variety within the female sex, as well as the male, though perhaps with not the same chance for public exhibition of these varieties, as exists today.

I do think there are two very fundamental things which may happen when many of these women go back into their homes. Perhaps before the war ends, millions of women will have had a type of work

experience alongside of men, doing the same jobs that men have done. Many of them have reported that if it were not for the additional home responsibilities they would consider these jobs cinches—not nearly as difficult as running a house and taking care of children. I don't think that type of woman is going to be too impressed with how hard her poor husband has to work when he gets back on that job. She is going to know more about his working life and perhaps be more helpful to him, more understanding, but also perhaps not mother him as much as has been the tendency of some American women.

The other result perhaps may be wishful thinking, but it does seem to me that after so many women have had this work experience and these broadened contacts, they will acquire a larger sense of responsibility that will extend beyond their own personal life and home into the community, into the country in general. I hope it will extend also into an effort to share in the building of a world where women will not have to be dragged out of their homes to produce material for war.

LISA SERGIO

HITLER has undertaken the job of pointing out to us what are the real values either in the nation or in the family or in human society in general, because those are the things that he has set about to destroy most completely. He has made it clear that the family is the most important source of strength and power within a nation. Because the family can even have the power to disrupt a form of government, he has set about systematically to destroy not only the material aspects of the family by separating men and women and destroying homes by bombing, but within the countries now under his rule he has also deliberately sought to destroy the great moral, spiritual, and sentimental beauty behind the family.

In order to do all this, he has tried first of all to destroy the women. It has become the official punishment for the women of all the occupied countries, whose crime was that they happened to have been Polish or French or Dutch or Norwegian, and who happen to be young and attractive, that they have been taken over *en masse,* thousands of them, and assigned to the job of being the prostitutes of the German army of occupation. Others who seemed to be good material for breeding experiments have been placed in those unspeakable mating camps to bear children they are not even allowed to see after they are born.

Why is this done? Naturally the problem of having a lot of new stock to draw from is essential to Hitler. But it is also because he does not want those children to grow up as normal children in a family. For example, 400,000 French children between the ages of twelve and sixteen will have to go to the Reich to work, I believe before the middle of April.

This has a double purpose. One, because the child hasn't his mind prepared to commit acts of sabotage as the fully grown French worker has and is not as dangerous an element to put into the Nazi factory; and second, because Hitler knows that all these children are being brought up today in France to hate Germans and that their parents are trying to inoculate the children with a passionate love of their country. Hitler therefore must take those children away from the French family.

So the nucleus of the family is being destroyed in France, and the same thing applies to Holland, to Norway, to Belgium and Luxemburg, and it applies even to the satellite countries. There the system is carried out in a very scientific manner, as it has been for years in Italy and Hungary and throughout the Balkans. Why? Because Hitler realizes that the family is most important, because the child's mind and emotions are molded more firmly in the family than even in the school. His formal academic training is influenced by the school, but the family counts most in turning out human beings. Therefore, Hitler has undertaken the systematic disruption of the family so that the idea of freedom and democracy in the invaded countries may be totally hauled out by the roots. When you think that there has been careful scientific study going on since 1930, going even beyond Hitler to the great pan-Germanic plan, when you think of the enormous effort put into the scientific study for the destruction of the family, you must realize what an important aspect of mankind the family is.

Even if some of us in America have to work in factories, we must preserve the feeling of family. If we forget that, there won't be any normal children—there will be just the children of the state, as Hitler has distinctly tried to make them. We have to be definitely sure that we succeed in doing this double job—our part in the war effort and keeping alive the family. Because, although I have no doubt the government agencies established in this country to take care of the children who otherwise would be neglected certainly cannot be named in the same breath with Nazi government agencies, there is still something about a government agency, even the most

democratic and kindest, that is just not home. Agencies have to turn children out according to the same mold, because they can't be expected to try to create individualism in children when they have to handle them by the thousands.

We must remember that the greatness of America, the ability of America to respond to the most tremendous challenge, has been because America is the land of individualism and we all have a different contribution to make. It is the sum total of our differences that makes our strength, and we must remember that unless we preserve the source of that individualism which is the home, there will be no real America after the war. And, what is worse, there will be no children left in the world who will have the profound understanding of what a family means so that they can go and restore courage and hope to those millions of children who populate Europe today who don't know what a real family is, and who have been brought up to despise it.

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

WHAT are some of the probabilities that we can look forward to in regard to the position of women after the war? In the first place, it is becoming fairly clear that there are going to be more women in proportion to men. If there are large war casualties there may be more unmarried women, because there will be fewer men available. We may begin to approach a situation similar to that which Europe saw after the last war.

What about the occupations and interests of women, both now and later? Many doors have been opened by war jobs, many new occupations, interests, professional and otherwise, have been opened to women. I think it has been amply demonstrated that they can go into any field, that they can achieve just as much as any man, and they can take it, too. The rationalizations that were offered that women couldn't do these things now sound very hollow.

But women are going to face a great many problems after the war. What, for example, about demobilization? What is going to happen to the women in the WAVES, WAACS, and all the other uniformed services? What is going to happen to all the women who have gone into war work? That is one of the questions the British women are asking. If we have made our contribution to the war and war production, do we have an equal claim to whatever jobs may be available?

It has been suggested that women may find that the business-life men have carried on isn't quite what it has been represented. They may have been much more impressed, I think, perhaps by the disorder and the conflicts, the ungenerosity, the ruthless and unscrupulous way in which business and politics, government, finance, are carried on. It may be worth while to ask ourselves what are women thinking about today, and how do they feel about the world in the future, what are they going to do when the war is over and they have to go back and face those questions from which they are now escaping. It would be worth while, too, to ask ourselves what are the new demands that women are making upon themselves now in order to live up to these requirements of wartime. And if they are making new demands upon themselves, is it likely they will make new demands upon society and new demands upon men?

We must remember that women have tried to accommodate themselves and fit into the historical developed pattern of feminine roles, into the old ideas and beliefs that have been worked out in our culture as a guide for what women can do with their lives. More recently they have been largely influenced, I venture to say, by the patterns held up in the movies. But are those older ideas and prescriptions as coercive as they once were? Are women becoming more critical of them?

Another question I would like to raise: What are women learning from this war? What is happening to their level of aspiration? Are they, after what has happened, going to be content with imitating men as the highest ideal of what they do? What have they discovered about our social life as they have gone out from the home? How much are they going to be influenced by the new knowledge about women's functions, giving them for the first time a scientific knowledge of their own functional capacity? Are they going to be increasingly impressed by the anachronism of older feminine ideas and roles that have been imposed on women to a very large extent by men? What I am trying to suggest is that there are tremendous conflicts and confusions in the lives of women that this war is not creating. They have been there for generations, but they are becoming acute now. Perhaps women are learning to recognize the source of those conflicts, beginning to see a little more clearly how they are torn between old loyalties and new. We have been hearing a great deal of talk about the dignity of man. Won't we now begin to ask whether that also includes the dignity of women, whether that is one of the ideals for which we are

(*Continued on page 90*)

The Roots of War in Human Nature:

Aggression and Hate in Childhood and Family Life

Chairman: Austin H. MacCormick
Speakers: Karl Menninger, M.D., Mary Shattuck Fisher, Margaret Mead

Does war begin in the nursery? Are hate and aggression part and parcel of human nature? How do the ways we manage our children's loves and hates during the early years set the stage for the kind of world we will have? How can we raise a new generation who can fight when they must, but whose aggressions are so directed that they can create a world of peace? Is war inevitable?

AUSTIN H. MacCORMICK

HATE and aggression are constant components of crime and activate criminal behavior to a much greater extent than the layman realizes. Although 95 per cent of all recorded major crimes are against property—theft, forgery, etc.—and only 5 per cent are against the person, yet the psychiatrist knows that hate and aggression are factors in a very large percentage of all crimes, and that they may be as truly present in the mildest and most impersonal offenses against property as in the most brutal and violent assaults.

In criminals' lives, hate usually does not lie on the surface for anyone to see. It is true that the crimes most of them commit are not particularly aggressive, in the ordinary sense of the term—not half as aggressive, for example, as getting on a subway train in the rush hours. But, in the criminals I have known, hate and aggression are steadily recurring factors in their personalities, merged almost indistinguishably with fear and a deep feeling of insecurity. I do not mean hatred of society, but hate that is the antithesis of love, the absence of love. I do not mean fear of police revolvers and G-men and judges, or the insecurity of not knowing when a hand will fall on one's shoulder and a prison gate will open and clang shut, but rather the fear and sense of insecurity that go back to some frustration, deprivation, or rejection in childhood. It is the fear and insecurity one keeps buried deep in the unconscious, never admitting their existence, but compensating for them furiously by hate and aggression. The effects of the hidden interplay of these forces are apparent in cases of petty thieves, mild-mannered confidence men, and amiable alcoholics, as well as in cases of violent crime.

Until parents and teachers and family physicians and clergymen comprehend all the implications of hate and aggression, face the fact that they are realities and not the ugly phantoms of some psychiatrist's imaginings, and recognize the need of turning these destructive energies into constructive and useful channels, we shall find ourselves forever involved in social and economic conflicts that are little short of war, and, generation after generation, in war itself.

It seems to me that we will understand war better, and perhaps put an end to it some day, if we frankly face the fact that it has its roots in aggressive traits, potentially constructive, that all of us have and that are activating forces in the life of even the youngest child in the most serene family circle. The constant competition among the children of a family for their parents' affection and attention is largely on the unconscious level. Hate is kept out of sight like an idiot monstrosity chained in the attic. The fear and sense of insecurity that result from frustration and rejection are unexpressed, often unfelt. But the destructively aggressive traits that they generate are none the less powerful because the dynamo is hidden.

The great essential in the development of a mature, well-adjusted human being is the sense of security that comes from knowing that one is loved. Lack of love, loss of love, rejection by parents in childhood, unresolved conflicts in family life, leave a wound that never heals, or, if it does, leaves scar tissue that distorts the personality as the scar of a severe burn on the face turns a smile into a bitter grimace.

One can acquire emotional surrogates, substitute securities, through marriage and the establishment of one's own family, through satisfaction in one's work, through one's adult friendships, through sound success honestly achieved, through love on the adult level. But the fortunate person is the one who has had the priceless boon of love and security from childhood.

The child is a potential warrior from birth, for the seeds of war are in him and they get their first growth in the emotionally competitive life of the family,

however much we try to evade this fact in our desire to idealize the home. What he needs most of all is the security that comes from having been wanted and loved from birth, and even before birth. That security, which can be had in even the poorest family, is the best shield against the impact of an overspeeded, overaggressive, overmechanized world, against a world always at war or on the brink of war. If one has it, he may still go to war, but he is not likely to start one. Wars are begun by the rejected and the frustrated. Some day the end may be put to wars by those who have achieved emotional and spiritual security.

KARL MENNINGER, M.D.

THERE is no doubt that in certain directions medical thinking has to be stimulated, spurred, and even led by intelligent lay attitudes. I see in the work of organizations like the Child Study Association of America an expression of a humanistic attitude which not only supplements and supports the work of the physician but in certain respects points to and leads the way for him. I am thinking of the physician as one primarily concerned with the health of *the child*—not with the health of the child's skin, or the regulation of his vitamin intake, or the regimentation of his bowel movements, but with the health of a developing human personality.

I confess that this was not always my point of view, and I owe it, in part, to the Child Study Association that my horizons have been enlarged. When I was a student in the Harvard Medical School the new specialty of pediatrics was in its heyday and since it centered very largely about complicated computations of the fat, sugar, and protein content of infant feedings, and since I had always been fond of mathematics, I became for the time being an ardent pediatrician. I got so that I could construct, within five minutes, a feeding prescription containing four and eight-tenths per cent sugar, two and seventy-five hundredths per cent protein, and three and nine-tenths per cent fat, distributed in feedings of five and seven-tenths ounces at six and a quarter hour intervals.

With all honor and credit to my alma mater and to some of the splendid teachers under whom I studied, it is my painful duty to record that I never heard one word from any teacher about anything pertaining to the child's emotions, to his attitudes toward food, to the attitudes of his parents toward him, or to the development of his total personality.

Times have changed since then. But I have the feeling that, even yet, pediatricians do not realize the importance of the work and the principles of child development. Child guidance clinics have done something to familiarize the public with the idea that certain children may be helped by a combination of psychiatric, psychological, and pediatric approach, but child psychiatry is still lamentably behind general psychiatry. This, in spite of the fact that more and more psychiatrists are unanimous in declaring that the root of every adult neurosis and psychosis is to be found in childhood.

I remember, in 1930, looking over the answers received in a contest conducted by *The Household Magazine,* in which mothers had been asked to submit their methods of "curing" their children of various bad habits, such as lying and running away. There were some excellent examples of intelligent parental behavior, but there were also some of the most shocking confessions I had ever seen. I learned from these letters—letters which were sent in on the naïve assumption that they would be possible prize winners—that the cruelty of parents to children is something far beyond ordinary recognition. When we read *Oliver Twist, Nicholas Nickleby,* and similar novels of social protest, we have the comfortable illusion that they refer to abuses of another day in another land. Unfortunately, this is an illusion.

During the last thirteen years I have looked further into this hostility toward children, and a few months ago Mrs. Menninger and I published the conclusions of our thinking and observing during this period. In the book, *Love Against Hate,* we made some definite suggestions for decreasing those unnecessary frustrations of the child which create in him patterns of hate for subsequent enactment in his future life. I should like to offer them here for the guidance of parents.

Every child should be guaranteed seven things:

1. He should have the opportunity for frequent sucking periods not limited in time, not artificially interrupted, and preferably at the mother's breast.

2. There should be no attempt to train the functions of excretion in accordance with adult standards until the child can sit alone securely, until he has acquired a primitive sign language by means of which he can make known his bodily needs, and until he shows some autonomous inclination to learn. In both excretion and feeding there is an innate rhythm for each individual child which must be observed and respected, since these rhythms are fundamental in the evolution of his feelings of satisfaction, body control, and personal adjustment.

3. There must be a long and uninterrupted period of consistent and skillful "psychological mothering" by one individual. This brings about a biological and psychological symbiosis in which two organisms with essentially different needs profit mutually, the mother getting the satisfaction of completing the creation of her child and the infant receiving both food and the primary experiences of need-consciousness and gratification which assist in bringing his sensory nervous system into a regulated functional activity. (These first three were originally suggested in somewhat this form by Dr. Margaretha Ribble.)

4. He should have a father and mother in harmonious relationship with one another to set a consistent pattern for his love development.

5. He should be spared reproaches, intimidations, threats, warnings, and punishments regarding physical manifestations of his sexuality. The example of the parents and the quickly perceived attitude of society are sufficient deterrents from unsocial behavior.

6. He should be accorded the dignity of being a separate individual possessed of his own needs, rights and feelings, which means that he should be given reasons and explanations within the reach of his understanding for the compliance required of him by parental authority.

7. In all communications with the child, truthfulness, honesty, and sincerity on the part of the parents are unequivocally essential.

In wartime there is a general feeling that we should concentrate upon the important things that affect our present and future security and defense and let the other matters wait until the world has more leisure. In my opinion, there is nothing more urgent or more important to our country than the care and education of children. It seems to me that organizations like the Child Study Association are in the first lines of defense. There are other organizations that seem more glamorous, more thrilling and more adventurous. But child care is like agriculture—it goes on quietly and undramatically, year in and year out. In wartime and in peacetime it is a bulwark of defense. It is unexciting, but it is of the greatest importance; and it must build not just for immediate needs but for continuing permanent effectiveness. Organizations like the Child Study Association represent that vast minority, the children, who are more concerned in the future than any of us and who have no voice or vote in arranging it. We need more recognition of the patient, loving work that goes into rearing children—the task of caring for a child, feeding him, dressing him, teaching him, interpreting the community to him.

We need, too, more discriminating appreciation of motherhood. I do not decry the glorification of motherhood, but I think we should know more about what constitutes good motherhood and what indicates bad motherhood. We should give mothers decorations or "E's" for individual merit just as we give medals for individual distinction in battle and in industry. But to have such discriminatory appreciation we must have more study of the child and a greater interest in him.

We often hear that there are more beds in our hospitals for mentally ill patients than for physically ill patients but, unfortunately, most of these beds are full of adults. There are many hospitals for crippled children and children with tuberculosis and heart disease but practically none for children who are mentally ill. This is in spite of the fact that neurotic children can be treated more effectively than adults, in spite of the fact that psychiatrists know that most mental illness has its origin in childhood, and in spite of the fact that some of the roots of war can be traced to the hatreds engendered in mishandled children. We know this but we do not heed it, simply because we do not wish to spend the necessary money and time and thought on the problem. We cannot make great progress until we realize that the study of the child and the threats to his development are a task equal in importance to the study of the stock market and the compounding of poisonous gases or the creating of air power. It is, of course, far more important than any of these, but we cannot expect this obvious fact to be immediately acceptable to a world as warped as ours.

It is not merely the fact that we do not realize the importance of children and child study which brands our civilization as warped. It is not merely that we are ignorant of facts that determine our destructiveness and negligence. The matter goes deeper than that. What blinds us to facts that are so obvious and so important is hatred—not only of others but of ourselves. Any civilization that makes the manufacture of bombs more urgent than the study of children is full of destructive hate and it is this that makes the task of earnest, thoughtful people so slow and difficult.

Yet I think there is hope for us. I am not such a dreamer as to suppose that any words of mine—or for that matter anything that a thousand psychiatrists or ten thousand philosophers might say—could revolutionize or even considerably alter the prevalent social

attitudes. Yet we know that they do change, that they are changing, and this gives us some hope for the future and some encouragement to speak out our thoughts, however feeble their effect may seem to be. Not only in regard to sex and the rights of women and children, but in regard to all human rights, there has been a vast change in social attitudes. Definitely the present war indicates a feeling of greater responsibility for the rights of other peoples. In spite of human frailties and errors, we may ultimately achieve a less artificial, more psychologically sound civilization, one more impatient with hypocrisy and empty idealism. It is not impossible to conceive of a time when the expression of love—in all the forms which it manifests itself—will be as natural, as spontaneous and as magnificently organized as is the expression of rage and hate at the present moment. It is not inconceivable that one day there will be councils on child care which will be as serious and as monumental as the councils of war.

But before that day comes we shall have learned more about ourselves. We shall have conceded the existence of evil within us, of aggressive tendencies that cannot be permitted to find their expression spontaneously, following a course of least resistance. We shall have revised our ways of living to include more play and our ways of working to insure more joy in work. The study of the child will have been recognized, not as a pretty little hobby for a few earnest missionaries and pedants, but as a justifiable measure of the first importance for national security and world peace. We shall have put a higher estimate upon the beautiful as a criterion of creativeness. We shall have gained the courage in that day to hate what is ugly.

We shall have accorded to love the preeminence which it deserves in our scale of values; we shall seek it and proclaim it as the highest virtue and the greatest boon. We shall not be ashamed to have "suffered much extremity for love," in the full realization that love is the medicine for the sickness of the world, a prescription often given, too rarely taken. We shall have realigned our faith in God to include more faith in human beings, and extended our identifications to include more brothers, more sisters, more sons and daughters in a vastly wider family concept.

In that day, when aggressiveness is fully recognized in ourselves, we shall have a different ideal in educating the child. I see education beginning at the cradle with the encouragement in the child of more freedom for aggressiveness, destructiveness and cruelty and with the giving of more affection, interest and attention by his elders. Childhood is the time for the children to be bad and the parents (and teachers) to be good, instead of vice versa. At present, by ignoring the fact that human beings have aggressive instincts which *will* find an outlet and which need education and direction toward constructive outlets, we seem determined that children shall be good while their elders are as destructive and cruel as possible. Naturally children look forward to adulthood as a time when they too will be privileged to be bad to revenge themselves. I do not believe that any plans for bettering the world can succeed only by seeing the good in others and ourselves. We must have the additional courage to see the hate also and to study its manifestations so that we may teach children not only to love but to manage their hate more wisely than we have. The *recognition* of the forces within us constitutes the first step in their control. Before we can have child betterment or child welfare or hope in our children we must have more child study.

MARY SHATTUCK FISHER

DOES war begin in the nursery? To what extent are hate and aggression nurtured by early experiences in the family? How do the ways we manage our children's loves and hates during the early years set the stage for the kind of world we shall have? These are basic and crucial questions which must be understood and answered honestly before we can work and plan realistically for a more humane and civilized future. Until we face these questions and their implications for education and social organization, we shall continue unwittingly to set the stage for bigger and better violence. The time may well be close at hand when the human race can no longer afford the luxury of culturally sanctioned outlets for hate and aggression—that is, war—and still survive. Even in the midst of total war we must recognize the part that early experiences within the family play in making it easier to perpetuate the institutions of war, and harder to invent new ways of solving conflicts between nations.

Before attempting to answer these basic questions specifically, or to generalize about their implications for the conduct of family life, it may prove helpful to consider for a moment expressions of aggression and hatred among normal American children. "Normal" is used advisedly, for we well know that a certain amount of fear, anger, and aggression are not only normal but inevitable in our culture. During their earliest years all children learn what they may and may not do, what is expected and permitted in their particular families, what kinds of behavior bring ap-

proval and love, and what kinds of behavior sometimes result in punishment and the loss of love. Varying amounts of conflict, uncertainty, fear, anger, and aggression are common childhood experiences in all homes. For purposes of illustration I have selected records of four children whose behavior is typical and yet happens to be particularly explosive.

(Dr. Fisher here cited four examples of typical aggressive behavior of three- and four-year-olds in nursery school.)

These four children—John, Marvin, Sarah, and David—are typical American children giving expression to the angers and fears which all children must learn to handle, control, and direct. What seem to be the real reasons why these four children are having stormier times than the other sixty-one children with whom they are associated in their particular nursery school groups? What can we learn from them about the needs of all children?

On the surface, John seems to be more deprived than the other three. His mother works full time; he has no father, except in fantasy. Yet John's behavior does not seem to reflect a deep-seated anxiety or real hostility. Marvin's angers are already more deeply rooted. The need of his parents to have a polite, clean, well-mannered child deprived Marvin very early in life of the capacity to admit and accept his genuine feelings. Like so many other American parents, Marvin's mother and father are afraid of emotions and deeply disturbed by their normal expression in childhood.

Sarah's mother, on the other hand, is not afraid of emotions, but must have a child whose feelings can be controlled at the mother's will. In other words, Sarah's mother wants to have a child who is superior, intelligent, creative, and spontaneous, yet at the same time one whose moods match her own. The "Who is going to win?" issue is particularly strong in Sarah's home, with two dominating personalities which happen to be very much alike in vitality and forcefulness.

David's parents are also typical of a large group in our American society who are particularly sensitive to spiritual and ethical values. The war is still a major emotional shock to such parents. Like so many others during this war period, their need to have nonaggressive, sensitive, ethically minded children has increased almost in direct proportion to their disillusionment and anxiety about the war. Shy, gentle, quiet David is suddenly surprising himself and everybody else with the violence of his feelings against the baby, and even his parents and older sister. Inevitably, David's parents are disturbed by such behavior. Although theoretically David is a loved and protected child, his present aggressive behavior makes a real acceptance and understanding by his parents extremely difficult.

Can we generalize, then, from our experience and observation of the Johns and Marvins, Sarahs and Davids who are being called upon to come to terms with life in a particularly difficult and violent time? We believe we can. With amazing consistency the most violent and persistent aggressions and hates among children occur in homes where adult standards are too high for little children and imposed too soon; where expressions of anger and hostility are misunderstood and constitute a serious threat to parents; where there are few chances or opportunities for the child to be adequate and successful in his own terms; where the success for the parents is symbolized by possessions, or positions, or by having the children meet certain kinds of socially approved behavior.

In other words, as long as generations of adults grow up afraid of their own emotions and their children's, as long as adults try to have their children live up to standards which are impossible and unrealistic and under circumstances which make it difficult for them to be adequate and successful at different stages of their development, then we must expect that the majority of these children will be anxious and confused, or defeated and passive. Instead of having anger and aggression and hostility as temporary responses to real situations—responses which can be outgrown as problems are solved and more competence is developed—anger, aggression, and hostility become deeply rooted in the very core or structure of the personality.

As we know only too well, anxious, confused, defeated, and passive children grow up with anger that must find an outlet, with hatred that must be turned against the self and one's own kind, as well as against the stranger and the weak. Because they do not and cannot respect and love themselves, such personalities must doubt and hate or fear their fellow men. Somehow, even in the midst of war, we must find wisdom and patience and love to free our own American children from the burden of hatred and fear, which need not be—but all too often still is—our American heritage. Somehow we must learn to use the power of maturity, possession, and love without sacrificing our children's integrity and spontaneity, and without bending them to serve our own needs. Surely in the universal experience of growing up in families lie many important clues to the possible solutions of the basic problems of war and peace. New social inven-

tions and organizations which outlaw war will be made and accepted by individuals who do not carry the burden of childish fears and angers into their adult lives.

MARGARET MEAD

IT SEEMS to me that the belief that war can be stopped in the nursery is a dangerous belief to be propagating at present because it offers an excuse for refusing to do anything else about war. If you try to stop wars in the nursery you have to bring up a whole generation in the right way, and you can't do that without first bringing up the right generation of parents. So we fix the nursery to produce the right parents, and we hope that in time those parents will produce the right children that in time will produce something or other, and meanwhile the problem of war remains unsettled.

I am going to appear to take issue, to some extent, not with the descriptions of human behavior or the amount of hostility and aggression which children may show under certain circumstances, but with the partial suggestion that we could stop war by altering our nursery procedures.

War is a human invention. It is an invention like marriage or writing or electric lights. We have absolutely no reason to believe that the human race had war at the beginning of its history, and we have many instances of societies that know nothing about war whatsoever. When it is a question of judging what is human nature, one society that exists without such an institution is sufficient to prove that this institution is not inevitable.

Of course we cannot say that any human institution that exists has no roots in human nature. If it had no roots in human nature and human potentialities would not fit into it at all, presumably it would not exist. So we cannot say that there are no roots for war. There are roots for war, but there are also roots for peace, there are roots for marriage and there are roots for handwriting in human nature. All of these are inventions that have been developed in the course of human history.

There seems to be an assumption in many discussions that war is based on aggression and hostility and destructiveness, and that those are the only aspects of human nature used in war. But a very superficial inspection of the behavior of human beings in war will show you that this is a very one-sided view. War also draws on a great many other aspects of human nature; it draws on the willingness to sacrifice, it draws on comradeship, loyalty, heroism and many other things that are good in themselves.

Actually, warfare is simply an invention made at one time in human history, which at one period at least served the purpose of getting people together in larger and larger units. It has grown more and more lethal, more and more expensive in society, so that now we feel that we cannot tolerate it. But warfare is an invention which once developed is very hard to displace. We are not going to get rid of it by changing the character of individual human beings unless we also make an invention that is superior.

One can find aggressive children in every society I have ever worked in—and I have worked in societies that had war and societies that had none. I have worked in societies whose idea of war was for the two opposing sides to go out and camp and make speeches for about three hours as to who wanted to begin first; then after a lot of discussion and politeness, they would decide that maybe they would begin to fight the next morning. They would both lie down and go to sleep and get up the next morning and fight; then one person would be killed and they would both stop. But this was war. They knew it was war; it was their social invention. Both sides marched out with an army, and it had all the proper trappings. It hardly invoked hostility, and certainly invoked very few of the emotions that we now associate with war, but as a social invention it was war.

I have also worked in another society that had no knowledge of war at all, but produced a great many frustrated, aggressive children. When they grew up, they hit their wives with burning coals, they smashed pots, cut down people's houses, and occasionally killed somebody. But they never went to war, because war was not an institution of that society.

It seems to me that if we want to get rid of war, we have to make an invention which will make war impossible. It can be displaced only by a superior invention, just as dueling and street fighting were displaced by an adequate police system. To do this, we did not change human nature, we simply changed the institutions in societies and we stopped bringing up little boys to believe that unless they got their pistols out when somebody mentioned their sisters' names they would be everlastingly disgraced. The little boys might be just as aggressive, just as destructive as before, but dueling was not the acceptable form of behavior for them because it had been outlawed.

I am not saying that the institution of warfare in society does not mean that children grow up to be

(*Continued on page 91*)

Our Children: The War and the Peace

Chairman: Anna Arnold Hedgman
Keynote Speaker: Eduard C. Lindeman
Panel: Alice V. Keliher, Tracy Strong, Ruth Taylor, Anna W. M. Wolf

How we can help children understand what we are fighting for. How deep is their appreciation of America's special problems and the true values of a democratic faith? How can we help them understand their responsibility for making American democracy really work? Their part in the peace to come. Family influence on children's attitudes toward economic questions, racial and religious tolerance, and the rights and dignity of all people.

ANNA ARNOLD HEDGMAN

LAST spring someone who had been working very effectively with after-school programs for young people asked me to talk with a group of twenty gang leaders about civilian defense. Nothing in my background had prepared me for actual contact with gang leaders, and the only thing which made me accept the invitation was that they were from twelve to fourteen. It seemed to me that any adult ought to be able at least to get out alive.

When the group of boys had settled around the table for discussion, I asked them what they were doing for civilian defense. They mentioned all the details about salvage—they had even had several gang wars over salvage—and they also discussed the various kinds of assistance they had been able to give the air raid warden, and their own community programs. As we talked along, I asked them if they had any notion of what we were fighting for.

"Oh," they said, "we are out to beat Hitler."

"Why are we out to beat Hitler?"

"Well, Hitler had the idea that some people were better than other people, and that had to be stopped. And, besides, he had been very, very cruel to Jewish children."

From there on the session became interesting indeed, as they discovered that they themselves had been fighting up and down the streets on both interracial and interfaith grounds. We discussed whether or not their private wars had anything to do with this larger war.

Before the afternoon was out, they had agreed that if we were going to present to the peace table anything like reality, we would have to be able to say that we have discovered ways of working together in America. Perhaps on their own block and in their schools could be found many of the answers in terms of everyday human relationships. I am sure that all of us will want to be conscious of asking ourselves how as adults we really relate to this business of developing democratic ideals in young people and how the problems of war and peace can be interpreted on a community level.

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

IF ANYBODY assumes that it is a simple task for adults to interpret this war to children, he should first try to interpret it to himself or to an adult group and see how much confusion there still is in this country even among intelligent people about the nature of this war. If you can explain to me in terms of clear-cut logic our political situation in North Africa, or if you can explain what is going on in our relationships with Spain, or some of the things which are happening in the colonial world in relation to this war, your explanations will transcend my own. I don't make any pretensions about being completely clear about these things; and I am sure that most of us should first of all come to our young people with this much humility.

Having begun with this much humility, I shall try to outline six specific points about the problem of children in this terrifying tragic period of war. First of all, I am glad that I am no longer alone in saying that whatever else we do with our children we must certainly tell them the truth about this war. In the past few weeks child specialists and psychiatrists have been making public announcements to this effect. Earlier in the winter I was impelled to write an article as a result of an experience I had in a midwestern town where I met with a group of teachers who were having a very serious discussion about how they were going to cover up this war so that children would be spared its horror and its terror. I sat dumfounded for about half an hour listening to these teachers talking

about how they were going to keep the war from these children. It was at that point that I made up my mind that adults were likely to make the same old mistake of not understanding how much more advanced the children are than they are.

I am sure the point is now clear that with the radio and the newspapers and all the avenues of communication coming straight into our homes, the children are not going to avoid this war. They are going to know that thirty million human beings have already been killed in this war, and that many hundreds of thousands of our own American boys are going to be killed. They are going to know all about this, and there is no way we can avoid sharing this tragic news with them.

The second point is that children, in order to comprehend this war, must have something to do with it, something constructive. Recently I found what seems to me the best definition of what children should be asked to do in an article by Dr. Douglas Thom of Boston. His language is so precise that I will quote it. "Parents and other adults must keep in mind that what children really need is an objective to work for which is saturated with realism. They want something definite and concrete, where the relationship between effort and result will be simple, direct and obviously valuable." This means not "made" work, of course, and work suitable to the child's age and understanding.

The third point, it seems to me, is one which is now becoming a problem of almost portentous fatefulness: how to teach children to understand the necessity of restrictions which wartime places upon us. I think we are on the verge of a moral disintegration in American life, because of food rationing, which will make our whole prohibition era look simple and innocent in comparison. We are likely to get such a bad moral tone from our attitude toward food rationing that it will seep into every family in this land, unless somehow or other, and very soon, some kind of educational movement can be formed around this problem. We should have had community organizations prepared for this problem long ago, but they neglected it. So instead of rationing being done by some sort of consenting process within little neighborhood groups, it is now being done from above by methods of compulsion and the attitudes toward it are, to me, terrifying. If you think we got a very bad result from that wierd period of prohibition, just begin to worry a little about what is likely to happen to us if we go through two, three, four, or five years of food rationing with children sitting about in family circles listening to adults discussing how they are going to avoid restrictions.

The fourth point has to do with war as peace. One of the peculiarities of this war is you can't talk about it without thinking about the purposes for which it may be used. Gertrude Stein has coined one word which has been of great benefit to me in these recent months. The word is "mid-during"—mid-during the war you have to live toward peace, not after the war. If you postpone peace until the fighting stops, then the peace is not going to be good. Children take naturally to this suggestion.

One of the more detailed questions which arises out of this, of course, is, in what terms can children understand the peace? I have an illustration from Great Britain which I think is apropos. In the schools of Great Britain, children even as young as four and five years of age are already engaged in drawing the designs and plans for the rebuilding of their towns and villages. Why not? Why shouldn't children now be putting their ideas into the kinds of places in which they want to live in the future? One of the surprises of the English experiment has been that as the children engage in these post-war plans for their own neighborhoods and villages they slowly but invariably begin to take an interest in planning the future of education. It seems to me also wholly proper that these young people should now be beginning to examine the kind of education which we have furnished them in the past.

I take for granted that nothing can be done more successfully with children than teaching them that when this war is over we shall make the most determined effort we have ever made in all history to see that no other generation of young people are ever again subjected to this kind of terror, that we are going to build a world structure of some kind, and that the children are not only to be its chief inheritors but are also to share in its design.

My fifth point has to do with the question of hate, that triple-edged sword which many friends of mine have taken up recently and are using so carelessly. It is a sword which injures your family or injures your friend, but the one thing you can be sure of is that it will debase you, that you will never again be the same person once you have learned how to hate. And I am afraid many young children in America are hearing discussions about hate in their family circles. Finally, here is a suggestion which I hope the teachers

(*Continued on page 92*)

Parents' Questions and Discussion

The questions published here are selected and discussed by the staff of the Child Study Association, and the answers written by various members. The department is edited by Helen G. Sternau.

My four-year-old still has temper tantrums. I have tried being patient, I have tried spankings and other punishments, and I have tried "ignoring" him. But in spite of everything, he sometimes goes completely "wild" when crossed. He screams, hurls things around the room, kicks, and even bites. Several times he has bitten his older brother; he has bitten me, too, and the habit seems to be growing on him.

It is impossible really to ignore such behavior. Leaving children all alone to fight it out by themselves is often considered the approved, progressive method of handling these violent rages, but it is doubtful whether such treatment really helps a child. Too often "walking out on him" just leaves him alone to his own fears, his inevitable bad conscience, and a sense of desertion. Adults often do not realize that when a child loses control of himself and is driven by blind hate and aggression to do things he knows are wrong, whether he admits it or not, he also becomes terribly frightened. He really wants someone to control him, to save him from his own worst self, to see that biting and kicking just do not happen.

A watchful parent or teacher can often see when a storm is brewing. This is the time to act, not after the child is uncontrollable. Go ahead with whatever demands you are making that are reasonable; keep firm, friendly, and unfrightened yourself. A child is quick to sense when a grown-up is intimidated.

If possible, catch the hand *before* it strikes or throws things. Prevent the child from biting by being quicker than he is. Let him know that he may *say* any angry thing he wants, but there are certain things he may not *do*. Don't be afraid to be positive and dogmatic about these things. Let the child know that you are there to see that he doesn't commit these acts of violence, because that's what a grown-up is for.

If, in spite of everything, the storm breaks, as it will now and then in the best regulated families, stay with the child quietly, but hold your ground and prevent extremes of violence. Sometimes it helps to let an angry child see that you know how he feels. "I know you're angry, but I can't let you break things," or "hurt other people," or whatever the issue is. "I know you want it, but it's really brother's. Let's see what we can find for you to do." Punishments, shaming, moral lectures, and arguments are usually useless. What a child needs is a grown-up who is on the side of his own conscience and who is quite positive about what is and is not permissible.

Lately I have been working as a C.D.V.O. volunteer in a day nursery. I never realized before how cruel children could be to each other. There's one little boy, for instance, whom all the others tease. They seem to pick on him constantly, and he howls a dozen times a day. Most of the children refuse to play with him. If we do manage to get him included in a group, the play usually ends in a squabble. I must admit we all find it hard to be nice to the child, much as we pity him. He's a whiney, nagging, rather selfish little boy. How can one help such a child?

Group cruelty of this kind is always hard to handle because basically the problem lies within the "picked on" child himself. He's just as disturbing to group peace as a typical bully, and really very much like one under the skin. The bully takes out his hostile feelings in open attack on others. The "picked on" child is a hostile person, too, but he is afraid to express his feelings openly. He manages to nag and demand in a weak sort of way, and ends by calling down on himself all the meanness he feels toward others. You noticed yourself that this little boy is irritating to adults, too. That's quite typical. Both types, the bully and "goat," are unhappy, insecure people who feel unloved and inferior. And, of course, their own behavior calls forth unpleasant reactions from others.

In trying to help such a child we must attack the problem at its root. Ideally, we should work with the parents to improve the home conditions which have made the child feel unloved or inferior. That isn't always possible. Within the nursery group it is wise to give the child extra attention and affectionate support and to help him develop skills which may win the respect of the other children. Sometimes it is possible to break the vicious circle of teasing and

hostility by teaching the "picked on" child to fight back instead of howling. If he once discovers that he *can* defend himself, he has taken a long step toward self-confidence. If he stops howling, it's no longer fun to tease him. But it's hard to teach such children to fight, as they are deeply afraid of their own aggressive feelings. It takes time and infinite patience to help these children.

For the past two months I have been working at a war job, not for patriotic reasons only, I admit, but because I really do need to supplement my husband's inadequate earnings. I figured that my children were at school most of the day (they are nine and twelve) and didn't need me at home as much as they used to. But it doesn't seem to work out that way. When they leave school, instead of going home (they have a latch key) they wander to neighbors' houses, where all the other mothers seem to be at home. Though I do get back in time to prepare dinner, I feel terribly uncertain about whether I am doing the right thing. What do you think?

Of course your children will miss you if they have been accustomed to having you at home when they are there, and they may even resent your absence. But that need not mean that they are really being neglected. You do have to weigh the needs—the economic one, your own emotional need for an outside occupation, and the children's desire to have you with them. What you bring into the home from your job, both in money and in stimulation, may outweigh the loss of those hours away from home. In your double role you will have to accept the fact that some things won't get done, and make conscious choices as to which things you will let go.

The actual hours between school and dinner need not be too great a loss to you or to the children if you manage, when you do come home, to listen to their day's doings and to be really *with* them through dinner and afterward. It isn't the number of hours you spend with your family but the way you spend them that counts.

Don't be too absorbed in the household chores to let the children feel your interest and concern with their problems. Talk over with them their feelings about your job, and enlist their cooperation in taking certain responsibilities to make things easier all around. Children usually rise to emergencies if they can see that the needs are real. You will want, of course, to make some sort of provision against the possibility of sickness so that there will be someone available to take over at such times.

In my neighborhood some of the shopkeepers are winking at rationing regulations and offering their regular customers all sorts of illegal extras. I have refused to benefit by this type of bootlegging, but my family can't see why we should do without things if others are getting the restricted foods. I begin to wonder whether I'm just strait-laced and priggish, as my adolescent youngsters claim. What do you think?

Of course you're not priggish. By all means stick to your principles. It's the only decent, patriotic thing to do, and really important. If honorable people succumb to this kind of temptation, the whole rationing plan will break down and our national morale will suffer seriously.

It is important, too, for your children to feel that you have real principles and the courage to uphold them. Even if they make fun of you for the moment, they'll respect you more for your stand and profit by your example in the long run.

Discuss rationing with your children. Be sure they understand its aim and its real significance in the war effort—that they visualize the ugly alternatives if this form of control breaks down. Most young people are patriotic and quite ready to make sacrifices when once they are convinced of their value. Your children may lack the experience to appreciate what is at stake. But they will almost surely respond to a direct appeal to their patriotism if the issue is made clear.

Suggestions for Study:

The American Family, 1943: Facing the Second Year of War

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

I. Women in the War

The shortage of manpower is drawing large numbers of women out of their homes and into war work. For many this is a welcome escape from isolation and unsolved personal problems. The social problems which we have neglected in times of peace are merely high-lighted by war conditions. Women are necessarily the child-bearers and homemakers. When they work at other tasks, too, most of them must fulfill a dual role. Many women have real contributions to make to the larger community and a genuine desire to serve, but our social arrangements have made little provision for their special needs. If they are to do justice to both of their roles, they need a variety of new social services to lighten home burdens—and

part-time work opportunities which leave time for home duties. It is to be hoped that the pressure of war may help to evolve the needed services and the specialized work opportunities. Such changes would enrich the lives of women after as well as during the war, and help to preserve their interest and participation in the affairs of the larger community.

II. The Roots of War

War is a socially accepted outlet for hate and aggression in our society, yet in some societies it is unknown. If we ever hope to stamp out war we must attack both aspects of the problem—the personal and the social. The anthropologists and sociologists urge us to bend our energies to the invention of better social machinery—more security for the individual and saner devices for settling international disputes. The psychiatrists bid us look to our nurseries so that we may rear a generation less driven by hate and aggression. Frustration and insecurity foster aggression, they tell us. Warm mothering and gentle, patient rearing, more satisfaction and less frustration in the nursery would produce human beings less prone to hate. Moreover, we must have the courage to face the hate and aggression within ourselves before we can learn to manage it constructively in our children.

III. Interpreting the War to Our Children

In order to interpret the war to our children we must first interpret it to ourselves and this is no simple task. We must try to be clear about our objectives for the war and the peace to follow. We can help our children most by telling them the truth —covering up neither the ugliness nor our own confusions. We can help to build attitudes for peace during the war—fostering the desire to participate in a better future, building world consciousness and the readiness to study and understand the vast problems ahead. Nor should we neglect the immediate task of helping our children to accept wartime restrictions in a constructive way. Parents who evade and bootleg—who fail to support regulations made for the common good—are seriously undermining the morals of their own children, as well as the morale of the nation.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Through volunteer war work, thousands of women are having their first experience of responsible community participation. They seem to feel more content with life and are making a valuable contribution. How might your community continue to use volunteers in peacetime? Have any social services been started which are worth carrying on after the war? Are other social services needed? Could they be manned in part by trained volunteers? How might an experiment of this sort be organized? Would you be willing to give time to such an undertaking after the war? Why?

2. Johnny is a headstrong little boy of five. When he's angry he stamps his foot and shouts at his mother: "You're mean! I hate you!" etc. His father thinks this behavior calls for spanking. Do you agree? How would you handle this kind of behavior? Why?

3. Mrs. Jones lets her three-month-old baby suck his thumb. The neighbors are quite horrified. They advise aluminum mitts or arm splints at once. Do you think they are right? How do babies usually react to such restraints? What might their effect be on the personality of the child?

4. A liberal teacher in a public high school has been discussing the status of Negroes in this country with his senior civics class. The school board objects and wants him to stick to the traditional civics syllabus. Is the teacher justified in raising this controversial issue? Is this good training in patriotism?

REFERENCE READING

Our Children Face War. By Anna W. M. Wolf. Houghton Mifflin, 1942.

You, Your Children and War. By Dorothy W. Baruch. D. Appleton-Century, 1942.

The Family in a World at War. Edited by Sidonie M. Gruenberg. Harper & Bros., 1942.

And Keep Your Powder Dry. By Margaret Mead. William Morrow & Co., 1942.

Love Against Hate. By Karl Menninger, M.D. Harcourt, Brace, 1942.

Pamphlet—Children in Wartime. Parents' Questions, Child Study Association of America, New York, 1943.

Book Reviews

Child Life in School: A Study of a Seven-Year-Old Group. By Barbara Biber, Lois B. Murphy, Louise P. Woodcock and Irma S. Black. E. P. Dutton & Co., N. Y., 1942. 658 pp. $3.75.

What are seven-year-olds like? How do they think and feel and act? What are their attitudes toward each other, toward adults, toward work and play of various kinds? How do they differ from each other in terms of sex or individual personality pattern? To what extent is there a common denominator of seven-year-oldness?

The Bank Street staff is to be congratulated on this excellent research report which answers these questions—at least tentatively—through an intensive study of seven-year-olds in a progressive school background.

There has been a real dearth of reliable material on the school-age child. Too many of the "scientific" studies have sacrificed all life and reality to the spurious objectivity of statistical tabulations. Here at last is an approach which respects the wholeness of personality and the reality of social situations. It gathers data by a variety of techniques, but always with a sensitive awareness of the meaning of behavior in all its aspects.

Vivid records of children's spontaneous behavior in work and play are balanced by a wealth of data from more controlled situations. Problem solving and performance tests, Rorschach and other projective techniques are employed. The result is a well-balanced and thoroughly scientific piece of work which still manages to convey the quality of child life and the feeling tone of progressive education.

HELEN G. STERNAU

Keep Them Human: The Young Child at Home. By C. Madeleine Dixon. The John Day Company, 1942. 156 pp. $1.50.

During recent years C. Madeleine Dixon has made a very special contribution to the understanding of young children, stressing their "high, wide, and deep" qualities, the subtle and moving feelings and responses which are so truly the essence of children's early years. In *Keep Them Human* she continues to interpret children in her unique fashion, this time against the background of a world at war. Perhaps this book is not as original or important as her earlier ones, but it serves a definite purpose by showing, in a casual and informal way, how we can keep today's children "human" so that they may best meet the world of tomorrow, as well as weather the storms of today.

This is not a book that delves deeply into the factors that affect the growing personalities of children. These things are, however, suggested and inferred in the author's warm, living picture of how children act and think and feel, when they are by themselves or in response to the adults around them. One might wish that she had discussed more specifically the importance of the quality of the relationship between parents and children, since the book has the subtitle "The Young Child at Home." Again, however, the tone of the book throughout implies the understanding, rich acceptance, and enjoyment of children, which is so essential a part of that relationship.

The book seems to be addressed not only to one specific audience, but to parents, junior aides who take over home responsibilities while mothers are away, and nursery school assistants. To all who are dealing with young children it offers both insight and helpful suggestions for meeting their needs at play and in the daily routine of the home. Miss Dixon's sympathy and understanding are infectious, and her book should reach a wide audience.

ALINE B. AUERBACH

IN QUEST OF FOSTER PARENTS

A Point of View on Homefinding

By DOROTHY HUTCHINSON

A practical and sensitive book which discusses the psychology and the inner significance of homefinding as it affects both the worker and the foster parent.

Procedures and methods enabling the case worker to become well acquainted with prospective foster parents and to evaluate their fitness for foster parenthood are described and illustrated with case records.

Special problems of homefinding in wartime are considered, with suggestions as to how they may be met.

Published for the New York School of Social Work. **$1.75**

CONCERNING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Progressive Changes in Our Perspectives

By HENRY W. THURSTON

"A richly illustrated summary of the past and present. . . . The author's warm, human interest in young delinquents as people gives the book an emotional appeal beyond its factual content."

—*The Family.*

$2.75

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Morningside Heights, New York

Children's Books

Supplement to winter listing of "Books of the Year for Children—1942"

Selected by the Children's Book Committee

JESUS' STORY. A Little New Testament. *With illustrations by Maud and Miska Petersham. Macmillan. 119 pp. $1.50.* For the youngest. The nativity, the childhood, the death and spiritual triumph of Jesus, told in Biblical language with exquisite illustrations. (6 to 9.)

AIRPLANE ANDY. *Written and illustrated by Sanford Tousey. Doubleday Doran. 43 pp. $1.00.* This short account of a boy's airplane ride with his pilot father answers many unformed questions for the 7 to 10's.

WATCHING FOR WINKIE. *Written and illustrated by Theresa Kalab. Longmans, Green. 40 pp. $1.75.* The RAF and pigeon message carriers are part of the excitement of a modern war episode which will be welcomed by young readers. (8 to 10.)

COUNTRY-STOP. *By Carolyn Sherwin Bailey. Illustrated by Grace Paull. Viking. 128 pp. $2.00.* A sense of time in nature, and warm human relationships in a story of one year in a little girl's life in the New England countryside. Bright illustrations. (8 to 10.)

THE WELCOME. *By Babette Deutsch. Illustrations by Marc Simont. Harper's. 197 pp. $2.00.* A young refugee in an American boys' school makes a place for himself and his sister in a fine, exciting story of today. (10 to 12.)

TREE IN THE TRAIL. *Written and illustrated by Holling C. Holling. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50.* An ancient cottonwood on the plains of the Great Southwest is a symbol of peace to a progression of people from the Indians to the covered wagons. Dramatic illustrations. (9 to 12.)

GIFT OF THE FOREST. *By R. Lal Singh and Eloise Lownsbery. Illustrated by Anne Vaughan. Longmans, Green. 296 pp. $2.50.* An entertaining and charming story of India, a village boy and his pet tiger. (10 and over.)

A FOREST WORLD. *By Felix Salten. Illustrated by Bob Kuhn. Bobbs-Merrill. 274 pp. $2.50.* Both farm and woodland animals share in this leisurely and sympathetic story by the author of "Bambi." (10 and over.)

HOMEMADE DOLLS IN FOREIGN DRESS. *Written and illustrated by Nina R. Jordan. Harcourt, Brace and Co. 200 pp. $2.00.* A valuable book for any worker in crafts as a basic project aid and a fascinating tool for the creative child.

25 NON-ROYALTY PLAYS FOR CHILDREN. *Compiled by M. Jagendorf. 316 pp.*

25 NON-ROYALTY ONE-ACT PLAYS FOR ALL-GIRL CASTS. *Compiled by Betty Smith. 359 pp. Greenberg. $2.50 each.* Two comprehensive collections of dramatic short plays on different age levels with practical suggestions helpful in amateur dramatics.

AMERICA SINGS: STORIES OF OUR COUNTRY'S GROWING. *Collected and told by Carl Carmer. Illustrated by Elizabeth Black Carmer. 243 pp. $3.00.* Full-flavored, lusty folk stories and the songs that grew out of them. A magnificent collection matched by superb illustrations.

SONGS OF AMERICAN FOLKS. *Collected by Satis N. Coleman and Adolph Bregman. Illustrated by Alanson Hewes. John Day Co. 128 pp. $2.25.* Songs that will be fun for the family to sing. Simple accompaniments.

THE TREE OF LIFE. *Edited by Ruth Smith. Illustrated by Boris Artzybasheff. Viking. 496 pp. $3.50.* Sensitive selections from the literatures of the great religions of the world. A beautiful book with fine drawings by Boris Artzybasheff. (All ages.)

NEW BOOKS OF UNUSUAL INTEREST

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

By ELIZABETH B. HURLOCK, Department of Psychology, Columbia University. *McGraw-Hill Publications in Psychology.* 478 pages, 6 x 9. $3.50

Presents the results of experimental studies of children, from birth to maturity, in a simplified form, as free as possible from statistical data and other technicalities. The material has been coordinated in such a way that the student may get a picture of the normal child in the different phases of his development, and common behavior problems are discussed with emphasis on their causes and the best methods of dealing with them.

CHILD BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT

Edited by ROGER G. BARKER and JACOB S. KOUNIN, University of Illinois, and HERBERT F. WRIGHT, Carleton College. *McGraw-Hill Publications in Psychology.* 643 pages, 6 x 9. $4.00

An important textbook designed to bridge the gap between the college classroom and the laboratory and clinic. It contains 35 outstanding and representative researches in the field, selected by a canvass of expert opinion, and prepared for college students by those who conducted the researches. The book is sufficiently broad in scope to include all important areas of investigation in the field of child psychology.

Send for copies on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK CO., Inc.

330 West 42nd Street

New York, N. Y.

FEEDING OUR OLD FASHIONED CHILDREN

By C. ANDERSON ALDRICH, M.D., Chief of Staff, Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago, and MARY M. ALDRICH

IT IS the purpose of this book to encourage parents in the scientific feeding of children by correlating the facts of nutrition with the principles of biology, of psychology, of growth and development, and with other knowledge useful and applicable to children. "Another little masterpiece like *Babies Are Human Beings,*" says Victor E. Stork, Chief of Medical Service of the Los Angeles Children's Hospital. The book is a companion volume to the authors' *Babies Are Human Beings.*

We have learned much about *what* to feed children, say the Aldriches, but we must not think only in terms of diets. We must have a sympathetic understanding of the child himself, of his response to food and to the various influences surrounding him if we would develop good eating habits in him.

Illustrated, $1.75

BABIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS

By C. ANDERSON ALDRICH, M.D., and MARY M. ALDRICH

WINNER of the thirteenth annual award made by *The Parents' Magazine* for the outstanding parents' book of 1939, *Babies Are Human Beings* is a book "not only to be read but to be reread and studied, chapter by chapter, by both mother and father," according to the *Journal of the A. M. A.*

It is a wise, sane, sympathetic interpretation of the day-by-day growth and development of the infant and young child, a growth and development which the wise parent will strive to supplement but not control. The authors believe that babies, like grownups, are distinct personalities, with their own ways of doing things, their own rights and privileges, which should be understood and respected. In the belief that "readiness to accept change is the basis of constructive child care," rules and regulations are dispensed with in favor of flexible, sympathetic methods based always upon the baby's ability to respond.

Illustrated, $1.75

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Radio Programs for Children

THE reappearance of Dick Tracy on the air after several years' absence seems to be a lapse from the general improvement that has been noted in the late afternoon juvenile programs. The past year has seen definite progress toward better production and more thoughtful selection of material from the point of view of its suitability to the young audience. The revival, therefore, of a program that has gangster and underworld life as its major theme is a jarring note.

It might be argued that children are listening to gangster programs, anyway. This brings to the fore a question that has often been raised as to what constitutes a "juvenile" program, and whether we need programs especially addressed to children, since we know that they are listening in vast numbers to programs ostensibly intended for adults. High among the program favorites of children are *The Shadow, Gangbusters, Mr. District Attorney, The Inner Sanctum*—certainly not "juveniles" in any sense. Yet children of all ages listen to them avidly. Why?

When we examine these favorites we find, despite differences of plot and presentation, certain invariables: excitement, suspense, and, common to all of them, murder. The size and devotion of the young audience to these programs leaves us little doubt that most children like it rough, that they are fascinated by crime and bloodshed, violence and horror. It is important for adults to face this unlovely fact.

Then why "juveniles" at all? The answer to this question seems obvious enough to those who are concerned with the interests and needs of children. Despite their evident fascination for children, the impact of adult programs of unmitigated violence is *not* controlled by the capacity of the young audience to "take it." The so-called juvenile program, on the other hand, *is* so controlled. To compete successfully for the children's attention, juvenile entertainment programs must offer them at least some of the elements and some of the satisfactions they are finding in the stronger and harsher adult fare. The difference is that subjects and heroes will be keyed to children's capacities, both intellectually and emotionally. Excitement, suspense, horror, even murder, are possible within a framework of story and theme suitable for children.

Along with the "thrillers," children are enjoying, too, some of the adult "funny" programs. *Jack Benny, Charlie McCarthy,* and *Fanny Brice* all have a large and devoted juvenile following. *Truth or Consequences* is another. Like other people, children love to laugh, and evidently the thing they find it easiest to laugh at is the discomfiture of some other fellow. Certainly in *Truth or Consequences* there is a sadistic quality which even adults seem to enjoy without shame, and children do, too. Jack Benny, the butt of everybody's wisecracks; Charlie McCarthy, always in trouble, and the utter confusion of Baby Snooks' Daddy—all these are, to the young idea, exceedingly funny. The questionable ethics and unsavory family attitudes of Baby Snooks' Daddy would never be tolerated on a program designed for children. Nevertheless, the slapstick and the obvious, rapid-fire comedy of programs of this kind might well find a suitable counterpart in juvenile programs. Probably one reason such comic relief is not more plentiful in children's programs is that good comedy writing is at a premium. And, of course, the top-ranking personalities of these comedians play a large part.

Another factor in some of these adult programs which endears them to children is the very intimate and personal note which pervades them. The children feel that the comedian is someone in whose personal life they are sharing. This, too, may be a helpful hint to the producers of juvenile programs.

Unique in its appeal to children is the *Henry Aldrich* program, with its family setting and its revelations of the struggle of the young for understanding and appreciation. Perhaps the major appeal of this program lies in the listener's identification with the young people in the play, whose eventual triumph over adult misunderstanding is deeply satisfying.

To some extent, of course, older children are listening to programs of news, soap opera. quiz programs, educational features and music which are tuned in also for other members of the family. These include many excellent programs from which they may derive both pleasure and profit, and also suggest wider possibilities for development in the juvenile field. But these are not, generally speaking, the programs for which they forsake all others.

By their free choices, our children are telling us plainly enough what they like in entertainment on the air. Can we, perhaps, find ways to meet these tastes in programs just as robust, just as funny, and just as appealing, but geared to the children's own levels of emotion and interest?

JOSETTE FRANK

Parent Education in the Child Care Program

PRESERVING FAMILY VALUES IN WARTIME

ON March 2, 1943, the day after the Child Study Association's Annual Institute, a special session for professional workers was held at Association Headquarters to discuss the question of how child care centers could be made to serve more than an emergency purpose and become an important source of strength for family life.

Muriel W. Brown of the U. S. Office of Education was chairman of the panel discussion and the members of the panel included:

Rose H. Alschuler, *Chairman, National Commission for Young Children;* Joseph Kirk Folsom, *Professor of Sociology, Vassar College;* Robert G. Foster, *Advisory Service, Merrill Palmer School;* Elinor S. Gimbel, *Chairman, The Committee for the Care of Young Children in Wartime;* Jean Schick Grossman, *Director Parent Education, Play Schools Association;* Helen Harris, *Executive Director, Mayor's Committee on Wartime Care of Children,* New York City; Louis Herbert, *Chief Technical Supervisor, Committee on Work Projects, New York City Board of Education;* Grace Langdon, *Family Life Education, Federal Works Agency;* Clara Savage Littledale, *Editor, Parents' Magazine;* Ernest G. Osborne, *Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University;* Marian C. Putnam, M.D., *The Children's Center,* Roxbury, Mass.; and Anna W. M. Wolf, *Family Guidance and Consultation Service of the Child Study Association.*

The minutes of this meeting as reported here give a more or less *verbatim* report of the proceedings and include most of the discussion.

Miss Brown: What would we like to have come out of this meeting? Can we agree on some fundamental questions?

The following questions were elicited from the audience and listed as a guide for the discussion about child care centers:

How shall we work with parents?
What are the goals?
In what field should we concern ourselves with parents?
What specific meanings do Child Care Centers have?
What educational values can we get out of the emergency situation that now exists?
How can we realize and utilize mothers' abilities?
How much do parents want cooperation?
What are the tasks of parent education now and in the future?

Mrs. Wolf: Many centers feel that parents are a side issue. What is the real purpose of child caring centers in wartime? Are they just for physical care, or can they have more value? Can they contribute to the parent's knowledge of the child? Can the child be developed in terms of the parent? Can positive values be given to each, enriching the whole relationship? Can parents be taken from the periphery of child caring centers and brought in to be an active force? When the shooting is over, can we have a finer relationship between parents and children?

Audience: The question is, can the teacher learn to enjoy the parents? This is an important angle of all this education.

Dr. Foster: Well, most teachers are just that—teachers. They are prepared to teach but not to educate.

Mrs. Gimbel: That point of view is coming. We see change emerging. Educators now want more participation of parents in schools. It's taking time, but the teacher is learning to accept and rely on the parent, though very slowly.

Dr. Foster: Parent-Teacher Associations are not yet a living forceful thing in Public Schools. There is still no real rapport between parents and staff.

Mrs. Gimbel: Parents have lost confidence in themselves as parents. This must be helped. They feel "little." How can we fix this?

Dr. Langdon: Parents are beginning to ask for help on household management, so that they can find more time for contact with their children. They want "mundane" help first and they are coming to the schools for that. After mundane help they begin to ask about emotional needs. This could be the beginning of that rapport between parents and teachers.

Miss Brown: Let's take child caring centers and see how this help can be brought in.

Dr. Osborne: The staff of child caring centers can learn much from parents. Had we had a good feeling for parents ten years ago, nursery schools could have been saved all this business of going through the cold scientific attitude toward children. We could have

learned from them that a combination of warmth and sense is the answer to working with children.

Miss Harris: How about parents who resist child caring centers? Don't we have an educational job to do here?

Miss Brown: Yes, there is a twofold job in child caring centers. To break down resistance to the centers, and to work on a cooperating basis when the parents do use them.

Dr. Herbert: Teachers are taught how to deal with children but not how to deal with adults. That is why there is such a lack of rapport between the two.

Mrs. Wolf: Teachers should *like* parents. But let's recognize the fact that many don't.

Dr. Herbert: We impose our programs upon both parents and children alike. We don't ask them to help in choosing a program, we simply impose what we have chosen upon them. How can we expect cooperation under such circumstances?

Mrs. Alschuler: Child caring centers should belong to the community and not just to the teachers, to choose and then impose these programs, as Dr. Herbert has pointed out. The community must feel it is their own program, not something foreign.

Audience: Group activity often leads away from the family interest. Isn't it true that sometimes community activities detract from the family as a center? Don't we need to put more activity back into the home?

Miss Brown: We started out with the attitude that the activities in these centers had something to give parents. Of course, now the idea is not only to give something to parents, but to work *with* them.

Dr. Foster: We've got to break down the common, traditional idea about educators. Educators have been too far removed from the people. We need to get back to them.

Mrs. Littledale: It seems to me that child caring centers can be just such a force. Isn't this a good place to start getting back to the people? If only we could get away, however, from this idea of parent *education*. Can't we call it cooperation? It's not a superimposed educational attitude that we want. What better place to start this new rapport with parents than in the nursery years when the needs of little children bring parent and teacher closer together than at any other time?

Mrs. Alschuler: Yes, let's get away from terminology and back to principles. Child care should be something inviting to all—educators, teachers and parents.

Mrs. Gimbel: Indeed, child caring centers want all children, all parents, all teachers reaching out to the complete community, excluding no one.

Audience: Isn't a counselling service a good way to reach deep into community needs?

Miss Brown: Yes, but a general activity program is what we want, with no emphasis on any one thing, but all needs answered. May we hear about the Roxbury Children's Center? Dr. Putnam has much to tell us, of an experiment in parent participation and community education.

Dr. Putnam: The parents of little children are always the most accessible, and here is the best point to begin cooperative contact with parents. The best preventive program can be found at this time in the nursery school. Child caring centers can reach out into the community as the Yale Nursery School has done. For instance, ten children come regularly to their nursery school, but two places are always kept open for problem children. These children can be watched in a normal nursery situation. Parents and teachers observe, discuss and plan. In this way, even in this simple instance, a normal community activity serves a special community need; parents and children here use the nursery school as a consultation system. What we need is to restore the self-confidence of parents. We must recognize that parents often understand a child better than a teacher, although their understanding may not be so articulate. Roxbury has resident and day care for the working mother's child and also a consultation service. The idea is to serve the whole community—psychiatrists, teachers, educators—everybody can learn from this kind of set-up where mothers are invited to join in the nursery program as far as their capacities permit. We also reach the pediatrician, nursery school teacher, and every person who comes in contact with the child, so that a concerted effort is made to understand each other as well as the child. Right now the emphasis is upon trying to help children upset by the war, but in any situation a mother must and should become part of the nursery school, according to her capacity. At Roxbury we require that every mother consult once a week with all the various people who come in contact with her child. A mother's club meets socially once a week, and every attempt is made to make the mothers feel that they belong to the center.

Dr. Osborne: Do mothers help in the routines?

Dr. Putnam: Mothers have free contacts, but no routine duties. They do not always work out well as assistants. However, where mothers are needed and

can be used this could be an ideal arrangement.

Audience: Many people feel that with all this getting together of teachers and educators, another form of bureaucracy is coming down upon them. Is the community taking over the child?

Dr. Langdon: The same force that attacked the social sciences and progressive education does this sort of criticizing. It is simply a reactionary force that has to be dealt with.

Audience: In this job of establishing a consultation service, what is to be done with a short-handed staff, financial need, organizational lacks?

Miss Brown: A consultation service is an excellent idea, but aren't we agreed that there is a new type of child care program where parents, teachers and children can work together, for the good of the family, and not necessarily in terms always of a special consultation service, which many people cannot afford. There are other values that can still be had, even without this facility. For instance, what can we do to implement understanding in the family and school through contacts with parents.

Mrs. Gimbel: Is a consultation service such a new idea? Isn't this newer? That there is a breakdown in the duality of the teacher-parent rôle, which are now becoming interchangeable. Mothers are beginning to feel that the nursery school can help their family situation through this new attitude of helpful cooperation from the teachers.

Dr. Langdon: It seems to me that parents can't participate too much right now in this new cooperative idea because there is an acute need for women in industry. Isn't our job right now to provide adequate care for their children on a physical scale?

Mrs. Gimbel: Yes, mothers right now want, fundamentally and first, to be able to place children in an adequately run nursery. They need to feel relief and satisfaction while working. After this physical need is fulfilled then we can start the parent cooperation idea. It's lucky that parents now are learning what a great deal of good a nursery school can do. It's going to make a good basis for further educational programs after the war.

Dr. Langdon: A group of people who must be reached are those who leave children in the care of older people and servants.

Mrs. Gimbel: Of course, and here's another point. Parents who are missing so much by working, can be helped by child caring centers to enjoy more fully the little time they do have with the children.

Miss Brown: That is what I meant when I was pointing out that a consultation service needn't be only psychiatric. It can be very much simpler. It can be "a whole picture" advice system.

Dr. Foster: One of the troubles with child caring centers is that labor is interested in Nursery Schools from its point of view and management from another. Each attempts to set up an answer, but the need is scattered so the supply is inadequate. It cannot reach all.

Miss Brown: Individual community planning is needed here to bring the needs and the answers together. In fact, that is always the purpose of community planning.

Mr. Herbert: We speak of teacher and parent, yet there is not much general teacher interest in child caring centers, except where the centers happen to be set up in schools and teacher attention is required.

Audience: Other people need to get together, too. Social workers and educators, nursery school teachers, dieticians, pediatricians, assistants; all must work to supplement the home. Cannot the social worker step in here to amalgamate this home and school situation?

Miss Brown: Yes, isn't that the background of our discussion? All needs, social, nutritional, emotional, working together to realize the best good of the family.

Mrs. Gimbel: That is why I want to point out again that we must use all community resources. People must know them and turn to them.

Miss Harris: That is the kind of job the New York Mayor's Committee for the Care of Children in Wartime is doing. The Mayor's Committee is investigating all community possibilities for child care centers. All available agencies and services are being brought together for an intensification of their services to each community.

Dr. Folsom: The long range goal of these centers is to help democracy in two ways. First, to develop happy, free children who accept their own rights and the rights of others naturally. Second, to develop well-adjusted families within themselves which will make for harmony and democracy right in the family fabric. This needs to be talked as every-day conversation. It's not to be preached or lectured about—it's to be lived with. We have too much of teachers keeping apart from the learners. This has to be changed. Exact knowledge should be talked spontaneously all the time; not kept as special program stuff. Reactionary programs can be fought by the dissemination of the best learning and the day by day living of it.

Mrs. Alschuler: Every child caring center in the community should have social workers, nutritionists, general help, psychiatrists, who will discuss all aspects of the family needs and relate center activities back to the home. A complete service could be set up centrally and brought, as a unit, to already set up community centers.

Dr. Langdon: In community services, let's be more democratic. Plain, ordinary citizens should be invited to participate, as well as experts. Each community has its own cross-section. We must learn to tap the citizen group for skilled services.

Mrs. Gimbel: Let's not forget the school-age child. They are a marvelous source of community activity. Many of them are discussing and planning a new community cooperation in a manner which is very mature for their years.

Miss Brown: Can we discuss Dr. Lindeman's statement that a good instance of parent education and cooperation with home issues would be the job of working out rationing problems with parents? What other issues in the family can be clarified in this same way?

Audience: What about the problem of the heavily burdened older child whose mother is working? What can be done to help here?

Dr. Foster: What are the criteria for problem-solving? Shall it be in terms of democracy, authority, mercy, justice or what? What permanent principles can we set up?

Mrs. Gimbel: It seems to me that the needs should determine the principles. Right now, for example, the community needs help in rationing. As for concrete help, stores can stay open later, and our city should see that children at least get hot lunches. In closing, let us not forget that every one here needs to push hard for progressive legislation to put through the projects we spoke of today.

Miss Brown: To sum up the discussion: We seem to be learning to meet needs from the home point of view. The new idea is emerging slowly, but it is coming. We can say, principally, that what child caring centers need first of all is a central leader who is an integrated person, who can lead the whole community, use its resources intelligently, answer its needs, understand its people as human beings and get all community agencies and skills into a working whole. "Dynamic training for life" is essential in this leader. She is the catalyst in any combination of people who helps each to contribute his best to the needs and welfare of the whole community.

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

(*Continued from page 71*)

fighting the war?

We are being told that after the war we are going to have an immense flood of new inventions and gadgets, new motor cars, new airplanes, new housing, new refrigerators, new this, that, and the other thing. A question which is very important to raise is, what kind of lives are we going to live with these new gadgets? Will we just carry on the old frustrations? Are we so preoccupied in making plans and programs which are largely directed to making other people do things, that we have forgotten that perhaps we ourselves will have to change if we are to realize this new world that we are dreaming about? Unless we have learned something from this war, and have unlearned some of the things that we should unlearn, there is not going to be any fundamental change in our social life.

Therefore, I raise the question of whether we don't have to examine the things we live by and for, the beliefs and ideas and the loyalties, and begin to try to see whether in this examination of ourselves we can't attack one of the most important problems of the post-war field. It is well known that in this country most of the programs for social welfare and social improvement for peace have been women's movements. There has been an immense expenditure of time and energy and devotion, and I am not being at all too critical when I say that the outcome has been very disproportionate to the human effort and energy and aspirations that have gone into these movements. Why? Isn't that a question women ought to begin to ask themselves, whether they have been directing their energies in the right direction, using the right strategy?

In summary I should like to say: Women seem to be emerging from many of the older traditional tasks, and there are very few guides or directions by which they can plan their new lives. It isn't a question of unloading the whole responsibility for remaking the family and social life on women, but rather that women are faced with the necessity of making certain decisions to an extent which men are not, and therefore they carry a larger responsibility and enjoy a greater opportunity to make the post-war world somewhat nearer to their hearts' desire. They must make choices, they must try to develop, somehow or other, a pattern to replace the older pattern which has become obsolete and unworkable. They must learn to discriminate about where they are going to use their

efforts, how they are going to lend themselves to various movements. Now, if women could work out answers to their own personal needs and aspirations, to this whole question of what roles they want to play, and what kind of human relations they want to develop, then I venture to suggest that much of the confusion and conflict in the other areas that we face in our post-war planning might be, if not resolved, at least reduced. The question is, can women muster the courage to undertake such tasks?

MARGARET MEAD

(*Continued from page 77*)

more aggressive and more destructive than they would have been otherwise; I mean that it does not work the other way around. You cannot simply start in the nursery and expect to end up with an alteration in social forms. It seems absolutely necessary that this generation now should not day-dream about the possibility of stopping war in tomorrow's nursery. We have to stop it now so that tomorrow's nursery will be a place fit to bring up children.

If we are going to make the sort of inventions that will permit a world order in which war will be as out of date as dueling is now, we are going to need, in the next twenty or thirty years, an exceedingly imaginative, secure and constructive population. The burden of making these new inventions and carrying them out is going to fall on our young people, on a group that at present is suffering from the impact of war. It seems to me that there are two very definite implications for us now if we want to do our share toward making inventions that will outlaw war. One of them, of course, is to take responsibility for what is happening in the community to the children whose fathers are away, to the children whose mothers have to work, to the children whose homes are upset by war conditions. That is probably the best thing that we can do, to see that as few children as possible suffer during this period so that when we need them most, ten years after the war when the world has more or less stabilized itself and it is possible to go ahead, we won't have a generation that has been maimed and distorted and frustrated and is unable to carry the burden which will need to be carried then.

In the second place, inside our own homes, there is a great danger, I think, that we may regard children in wartime as more aggressive than in peacetime, because war has brought out in all of us our latent hostilities and destructiveness. There is a danger that adults, uncertain and nervous before the arousal of their own aggressiveness and destructiveness by the conditions of war, may project upon their children their own fears and find a game of toy pistols far more warlike than the children mean it to be. The natural content of children's play in war will naturally be the materials of war, the things they read about, see in the papers, hear about every day.

In a very peaceful world the little boy who goes around with a pistol and says, "I want to kill you," is probably expressing a pretty high degree of aggression and destructiveness. But in a wartime period it is probable that we had better look at the one little boy who hasn't any pistol and see what is wrong with him. It is important to realize that the child who points his toy gun in wartime not only may not be *more* hostile than his prototype in peacetime, but that he may actually be *less* hostile. A popular belief that children in wartime become more aggressive and destructive can do much to hamper the upbringing of a generation of children which should be secure enough to stop war.

But as long as we think that the only way to solve a disagreement between nations is to go to war, that the only way to get more land is to go to war, then even without destructive and hostile people, even without the type of distortion that has produced some of our fascist leaders, we are in danger of war. It is necessary not to let our desire to improve the nursery interfere with our understanding that unless we can also make new inventions for war we will have war. War is not rooted in human nature but merely rooted in history.

Compliments of

Casual Clothes, INC

745 Madison Avenue, New York

IMPORTANT ADDRESSES

SETTLEMENT SHOP

851 MADISON AVENUE

BUtterfield 8-2587

PARK AVENUE

Grocers

1065 Park Avenue • New York City

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

(*Continued from page 79*)

in this country may be able to take up, as well as the parents. We have in this global war an opportunity to expand our knowledge, as well as our children's knowledge, in a geographical sense. World consciousness in one sense depends upon world knowledge, and we have been sadly ignorant about some sections of the world which henceforth are going to play a fateful part in our future. Just think of the poetical opportunity of making rhymes and jingles and playlets with children about such fantastic names as Bengazi and Bizerte, the very pronunciation of which gives you a lift, words which a few years ago were not a part of our consciousness at all. Now all those far-off names have come into an intimate relationship with families of American boys who have fought in these places, shed their blood in them. We have an opportunity to use this tragic circumstance, too, in expanding our world consciousness.

THE PANEL

THE discussion of the panel centered mainly on the very timely problem of food rationing and the moral, as well as practical, problems which it brings to the family. There was a very strong feeling that the answer lies in education through small neighborhood groups, perhaps in one apartment house, or a group of houses on one block. It should not be hard to explain the real reason behind rationing—an experiment in equality in sharing—and why, if it is not obeyed with scrupulous honesty, we will inevitably come out of it with moral degradation. But to be successful this moral pressure should not come from Washington but from community groups.

On the larger question of how children are to be taught the fundamental issues of democracy the group agreed that if this job is to be done effectively it must have its roots in family life. The attitudes children grow up with will be determined not so much by what they are taught in the schools but by what they see and think and feel at home. Children begin to learn about democracy, for example, not so much when they study the Constitution but in the nursery, in the relationships within the family.

What children will feel about democratic ways depends on how their parents feel about it, how they see their parents treat salespeople, the delivery man; how they react to other classes and races. Democracy comes alive for children not through lip service but through everyday examples of democratic living.

It's a Wise Woman Who Saves Every Day!

★

A&P FOOD STORES

FAMOUS FOR THRIFT
OVER 83 YEARS

METROPOLITAN

FIREPROOF WAREHOUSE, Inc.

Storage · Moving
Packing · Shipping

SPECIAL VAULTS
for, Silver, Rugs, Drapes

FURS AND RUGS
Demothed and Stored

AMSTERDAM AVE. at 83rd St., N. Y.
Phone TRafalgar 7-6800

News and Notes

Spring Book Festival

The annual Children's Book Festival, sponsored by the *New York Herald Tribune,* has been announced for May 22 to 29. Awards will be made to the best books published this spring in three age groups. Books for very young children will be judged by Ruth Sawyer and Miska Petersham. For the middle-aged group the judges will be Josette Frank and Armstrong Sperry. For the older children's books the judges will be Margaret C. Scoggin and Leo Lerman.

A special book exhibit will be featured at the *Herald Tribune* auditorium from May 24 through May 29.

Family Life Education

A three-weeks workshop in Family Education will be offered from June 28 to July 16 at the 1943 Summer session of Mills College, California. This will be given under the auspices of the American Institute of Family Relations and the staff will include Frances Bruce Strain, author of "New Patterns in Sex Teaching" and "Being Born"; Dr. John H. Furbay, Associate Professor of Education at Mills College; and Dr. Paul Popenoe, General Secretary of the American Institute of Family Relations.

This workshop is designed for those who are teaching courses on marriage and family relations or preparing to do so; for parent-teacher leaders, religious workers, organization executives, parents and others who deal with boy-girl relationships, for marriage counsellors, and persons who wish to prepare themselves intelligently for family life. The program will be informal and personalized; each participant will work on some project of his own, under experienced supervision and in collaboration with other members of the group. Graduate or undergraduate credit is offered to those of college standing.

For further information write to The American Institute of Family Relations, 607 S. Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Teachers' Manuals

The Service Bureau for Intercultural Education is sponsoring the publication of a series of teachers' manuals and resource units designed to improve the relationships of racial and ethnic groups in the United States and throughout the world. The manuals will be issued under the general title, "Problems of Race and Culture in American Education," and will be published by Harper and Brothers during the current school year. The introductory manual is "Intercultural Education in American Schools: Proposed Objectives and Methods," by William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole. (Price, $1.00)

Other titles which have been announced include: "Dramatizing Community Culture Problems in the Public School," by Francis Bosworth; "Let's Look at Negro America," by Edmonia White Grant; "Historical Backgrounds of Ethnic Differences," by Bruno Lasker and William A. Hamm; and "Peoples of the United States," by Simon Marcson.

For further information about these manuals and the purposes of the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, address the bureau at 221 West 57th Street, New York City.

Summer Session

Sarah Lawrence College announces a group of summer session courses for teachers and other professional workers, laymen with adequate background, and graduates and undergraduates of accredited colleges. Opportunities for field work in community activities, and individual and small group conferences will be featured in the summer session.

The two main fields which will be featured are: "War and Postwar International Problems," with studies directed toward an understanding of intellectual, political, and social problems in the Americas and Europe; and "Community Relations," with emphasis on training for the fields of child care, consumer education, nutrition and other community services, and including a child care center workshop.

The full term session will extend from June 9 to August 3—and there will also be two shorter terms, from June 23 to August 3, and from July 7 to August 3. Address inquiries to the Director of the Summer Session, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.

Family Community Digest

A new magazine, the *Family Community Digest* was launched this February by the National Council of Parent Education. It is jointly sponsored also by the Vassar College Summer Institute for Family and Child Care Services in Wartime, the Institute on Personality Development, the Merrill-Palmer School, and the Progressive Education Association.

The *Digest* is designed to promote democratic home and community life. It will present, through original contributions as well as through condensations of books and articles published elsewhere, the important findings on such subjects as civilian health and safety, child and family life in wartime, consumer education, creative school practices, and the community role of women.

The subscription rate is $1.00 a year, and publication address is Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Early Childhood Education

An intensive practical course in Nursery School and Kindergarten Education will be offered at Teachers College, Columbia University, June 14 through July 2. The course is planned to give students in Early Childhood Education and related areas such as Guidance, Nutrition, Health, Nursing, etc., an opportunity to carry the responsibility of administering and teaching in nursery school and kindergarten groups under supervision.

A two-hour class will be held daily which will include discussions of problems and presentations of factual material relevant to nursery school and kindergarten education. Students must plan to spend the full day, 8:30 A.M. until 5 P.M., daily, Saturday until 12:30, in the Summer Childhood Center of Teachers College.

For further information apply to: Miss Margaret M. Gardiner, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Education by Radio

The fourteenth Institute for Education sponsored by Ohio State University will be held from April 30th to May 3rd at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel in Columbus, Ohio. The Institute was established by the University to provide an annual opportunity for joint discussion by broadcasters, educators and civic leaders of the problems of educational broadcasting. The subject for this year's Institute will be "Radio in the War and After" and the conference as usual will be divided into general sessions, work-study groups, section meetings, and round-table discussions.

The topics for the general sessions include "Radio's Wartime Strategy," "Problems of Wartime Operation," "Radio Interpreting a Region" and "Radio and the Post-War World." There will be a special work-study group devoted to children's programs and a round-table Children's Program Idea Exchange.

Reservations should be made by writing directly to the Deshler-Wallick Hotel in Columbus, Ohio.

In the Magazines

The Modern American Parent. By Margaret C.-L. Gildea, M.D. Mental Hygiene, January, 1943.

Brilliant and witty survey of parents' attitudes toward themselves and their children. The pendulum's swing from the Victorian to the ultra-progressive, back to our midway point of view, is described, with graphic stories. The account of adolescence is especially vivid; and the bewildered parent will be helped by learning how to use the "easy hilarity" of the adolescent as a tool in social discipline.

The detachment which "progressive" parents were told to cultivate in the 'twenties can now be relaxed; "now one may express one's emotion to the child; one may issue commands." But parents are warned against the pendulum swinging too far, against feeling that they can do no wrong.

New Hope for Victims of Rheumatic Fever. By Robert H. Feldt, M.D. Parents' Magazine, March, 1943.

Rheumatic fever is responsible for more than two-thirds of all heart trouble in young people. Sulfanilamide has been found to prevent the recurrence of a first attack in 99 per cent of a group of several hundred children and young adults, compared with a recurrence rate of between 10 and 35 per cent among control patients. Inasmuch as the degree of heart damage increases with each attack, this new development is very significant.

Should Children Play at War? By Sidonie M. Gruenberg. National-Parent Teacher, March, 1943.

Because children's play is imitative, it is unrealistic to teach them that although grown-ups may bend all their energies to winning the war, children may not even play at make-believe war. Trying to stop children from playing at war is, in effect, excluding them from the world in which they live. Besides, hostile and aggressive feelings are present in all normal children, and especially in wartime they get some of their anxieties and hostilities out of their systems through playing at war.

Our task is neither to overprotect children by keeping them away from war play nor to neglect the guidance of their primitive impulses. It is rather to provide them with wholesome surroundings and to help them use their energies in constructive ways.

Henry W. Simon, Professor Columbia University and Music Critic of "PM," says:

"Camp Wigwam, as I have known it, is one of the best equipped camps in the country; . . . the educational program is based on the best tenets of progressive education . . . through participation rather than theory; and the needs of boys are always consulted first in mapping out the work and developing the magnificent resources of the camp."

CAMP WIGWAM FOR BOYS
Harrison, Maine

Directors:
Abraham Mandelstam
40 W. 72d St., N. Y. C.
Arnold M. Lehman
666 West End Ave., N. Y. C.

TIMBERLINE JEWETT, N. Y. Elevation 2300 ft.

PARENT-CHILD CAMP: A Pioneering Idea in family vacationing, designed to promote family growth and understanding.

CHILDREN: Nursery school program enriched by contact with full farm routine: milking, planting, vegetables and flowers, haying, care of animals. . . .

PARENTS: Free of household cares and chores. Complete sports facilities—tennis, swimming, badminton, volley ball. Creative activity to promote war effort within farm community.

SARAH R. RIEDMAN, *Director*
1066 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y. • PR 2-0325

WOODCLIFF Sawkill, Kingston, N. Y.

Progressive co-educational camp. Capacity 85. Enriched flexible program. Complete athletic facilities. Private lake. Individual attention. Rate $275. Tenth season.

Directors: Anna G. Sachère—Lee Krinsky
1813 East 19th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. ESplanade 5-8847

Compliments of
BARBIZON-PLAZA HOTEL
58th STREET at 6th AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

Special Offer: Autographed Copy of

OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR

by ANNA W. M. WOLF

How can we, as parents, guide our children through this war period when their established patterns of daily life are confused?
How can we explain the war to our children? What can we learn from British experience?
Does modern education make our children soft? Should we teach them to hate?

Anna W. M. Wolf, senior staff member of the Family Guidance and Consultation Service of the Child Study Association, considers these and other vital questions in this new book.

For the second consecutive year Mrs. Wolf has been awarded the *Parents' Magazine* medal for an outstanding book of the year for parents. Last year the medal was awarded to "PARENTS' MANUAL." This year "OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR" has just been honored.

We are happy to offer "OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR" to our readers in combination with CHILD STUDY QUARTERLY at a reduced price.

OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR	**Published price**	**$2.00**
CHILD STUDY QUARTERLY (for one year)		**1.00**
	TOTAL	**$3.00**

SPECIAL COMBINATION PRICE NOW $2.50

Subscribers to CHILD STUDY may extend their own subscriptions for one year, or enter a gift subscription for a friend.

To take advantage of this offer, please return this coupon with your check to

CHILD STUDY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
221 West 57th Street • New York, N. Y.

☐ $2.50 OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR and CHILD STUDY QUARTERLY
☐ $2.00 OUR CHILDREN FACE WAR
☐ $1.00 CHILD STUDY for one year

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CAMP HIAWATHA
KEZAR FALLS MAINE

Established 1920. Limited to seventy-five girls. Every camp facility for all sports on land and water. Dramatics, dancing, music, crafts, riding, and other activities geared to war needs.

Lucile R. Ryttenberg • 260 West End Avenue, New York City

INFIELD ACRES
A Farm Camp

Blue Mountain, Saugerties, N. Y.

Boys, Girls, 4-12. Boys' Work Group, 12-14. Gardening, animals, swimming. Sports. Enriched Activities. Tutoring. Relaxed Atmosphere. Expert Staff. Modern Buildings.

BENTLEY SCHOOL
48 West 86th St., N. Y. C. • TR. 4-1661

camp kokosing for boys
Thetford Center, Vt. • 17th Season

Farm-Work Program

WILLIAM ROTHENBERG — 342 Madison Ave., N. Y. City MU 6-1143

CAMP LENORE for girls, in the BERKSHIRES

A progressive camp with informal non-competitive program. All land and water sports, riding, rich cultural program.

In its 26th season

Mrs. and Mrs. I. Spectorsky
1 West 85th Street, New York City — TRafalgar 7-4983

MON-O-MOY
The SEA CAMPS for BOYS at Brewster, Mass., on Cape Cod

Sailing and Navigation, Seamanship. Naval Unit. Riding and Riflery. Shop and Farm Work. Tutoring. Physical Fitness. Cabins. Nurse. Junior Counselor's Training Course. Junior, Intermediate, Senior Camps. *Booklet.*

Sister-Camp Wono for girls 6-16

HARRIMAN S. DODD • AUBURN, MASSACHUSETTS

CAMP UTOPIA • Narrowsburg, New York

25th Year, Shawanga Mts. 110 miles, N. Y. C. 1,400-ft. Alt. Separate camps for Boys and Girls. Private Lake. Arts, Crafts, Athletics, Swimming, Boating, Gardening. First Aid, Nutrition, Out-post Camping. Nursery Group included. Isidor & Laura J. Liebow, 1710 Avenue H, Brooklyn, N. Y. MA 6-2214.

WE HAVE THEIR CONFIDENCE!

That's why the finest families in ever-increasing numbers send their children to our camps.

CAMP OQUAGO FOR GIRLS — On Oquaga (Perch) Lake — Ages 6 to 17 · Founded 1929

TUNIS LAKE CAMP FOR BOYS — On Tunis Lake — Ages 6 to 17 · Founded 1922

These camps are a children's wonderland come true. Land and water sports. Cultural activities. Art, crafts, dramatics and music. Private lakes. Pasteurized milk. Hot and cold showers in ultra-modern bungalows. Twentieth Year. "Camp life with home comforts."

TULIP CAMP A healthy, happy summer home for Children 3 to 6 years of age. Gently, but firmly, we help build strong little bodies—in accordance with modern progressive methods. And the children adore it! Licensed physician. Trained nurse. Bathtubs, showers in every room. Highly endorsed.
ANDES, N. Y., *Del. County*

Mr. and Mrs. Aaron J. Mirski, *Directors*
Booking Office One Madison Ave., N. Y. C.

CAMP ARCADIA
Boys 6 to 17 — MAINE — 28th Year

Non-regimented. Progressive program. Emphasis on farming, sailing, fishing, golf, riding, crafts, nature, canoe trips. Bungalows with toilets and electricity. "A" rating.

Benj. Baumritter, 123 W. 93rd Street, N. Y. C. Tel. Riv. 9-4179

DARIEN
Boys and Girls 5-13
40 miles from N. Y. City
In Connecticut 17th Season

Camp life plus home comforts

Non-regimented; progressive program; small camp; farming, gardening, modern buildings, sleeping porches, woods, lake. Mature counsellors, trained in child guidance.

Herman K. Baumritter, 123 W. 93rd Street, N. Y. C. Riv. 9-1869

FARM CAMP
40 MILES FROM NEW YORK CITY

Camp Darien, established 1927, separate unit, ten boys, ages 12-14, part of each day working on a farm. Excellent facilities. Moderate fee. Herman K. Baumritter, 123 West 93d Street, New York City. RI 9-1869.

Camp Life Plus Farming

DEER LAKE CAMP
Madison, Conn.

A small vacation camp where boys can be themselves

50 boys, 7-15 yrs. Fee $325
100 miles from New York City

Directors: Ralph C. Hill
Elizabeth Goldsmith Hill

Madison Connecticut

HIGH MOWING SCHOOL
Wilton, New Hampshire

Purposeful school life directed by a qualified and experienced faculty. College preparatory and general courses. Beautiful buildings accommodate 60 pupils. Country life and farm activities. Dairy products, meat, fruit and vegetables from the farm. Separate lower school. Co-educational throughout.

Mrs. Beulah H. Emmet, Principal

Distinctive BOARDING and DAY Camp for Boys and Girls

HUDSON CAMP

Here on a picturesque country estate your child, from 5-13 years, can enjoy a Summer's camp life with all the modern facilities of your own home. Beautifully landscaped with added advantages of swimming pool, riding, dramatics, crafts, music, tennis, farming (ponies, rabbits, chickens, and other animals), the Hudson Camp has for its aim the complete development of your boy and girl. Experienced staff. Carefully regulated diet.

Send for Illustrated Booklet.

All Facilities for DAY CAMPERS

Quaker Ridge Road, New Rochelle, N. Y. • New Rochelle 2-7359